FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-059
Tuesday
27 March 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-059 CONTENTS *27 March 1990*

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

U.S. Persistence With SDI Programs Deplored *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 22 Mar]* 1
Reportage on 7th Anniversary of SDI 1
  Opponents, Supporters *[TASS]* 1
  'New Demands To Speed It Up' *[Zorin on Moscow International]* 2
Krasnoyarsk Radar Station's Future Considered *[MOSCOW NEWS No 11]* 2
Bacteriological Weapons Ban Convention Noted *[TASS]* 3

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

NATO's Woerner Cited on Deterrence, Security *[PRAVDA 26 Mar]* 5
Chernyshev Analyzes NATO Need To Alter Policy *[TASS]* 5
Readers Reassured on Defense Capability *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 24 Mar]* 5
Gerasimov Gives Briefing on Development Bank *[IZVESTIYA 25 Mar]* 7
Stability Paramount in German Settlement *[IZVESTIYA 24 Mar]* 8
Solton Comments on Need for European Summit *[Moscow International]* 9
'Helsinki 2' Urged To Aid European Stability *[PRAVDA 25 Mar]* 10
Vorontsov Briefing on Near East Issues Reported *[IZVESTIYA 24 Mar]* 11
'First Signs' of Thaw in Asia Welcomed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 25 Mar]* 12

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Gorbachev, Kennedy Discuss Relations, Lithuania *[PRAVDA 27 Mar]* 14
Further Reportage on U.S. Admiral Crowe's Visit 14
  Crowe Addresses Moscow Press *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 22 Mar]* 14
  Akhromeyev-Crowe Press Conference *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 24 Mar]* 15
  Crowe Queried on Military Ties *[IZVESTIYA 24 Mar]* 15
U.S. Demonsatration in Support of Hostages Noted *[PRAVDA 25 Mar]* 16

Northeast Asia

Soviets Remind North Korea of Past Sacrifices *[Moscow International]* 17
  Further on Interview *[Moscow International]* 18
Roots of DPRK Revolutionary Fervor Viewed *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 21 Mar]* 19
Speculation About Contents of Gorbachev Reply *[Seoul YONHAP]* 22
ROK's Kim Yong-sam Cited on Soviet Ties *[TASS]* 22
Frolov Receives Japanese Documentary-Makers *[PRAVDA 24 Mar]* 23

Near East & South Asia

Aeroflot Transport Plane Crashes in Kabul *[TASS]* 23
Iran's Reaction to Lithuanian Incidents Noted *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 23
Report on Iranian Cosmonaut Denied *[IZVESTIYA 22 Mar]* 24
Supreme Soviet Delegation Pays Visit to PDRY 24
  Arrives in Aden 26 Mar *[TASS]* 24
  Visits N. Yemen *[TASS]* 25
Palestinian Trade Union Delegation Visits *[TRUD 15 Mar]* 25
Polyakov Cited on Visit to Arabian Peninsula *[Moscow International]* 26
Broadcasting Protocol Signed With Morocco *[TASS]* 27

Sub-Saharan Africa

Shevardnadze Ends African Visit, Returns Home 27
    Ends Visit to Nigeria, Africa *[TASS]* 27
    Gives Final News Conference *[TASS]* 27
    More on Lagos News Conference *[TASS]* 30
    Departs for Home *[TASS]* 32
Joint Soviet-Nigerian Communique Issued *[TASS]* 32
Commentary Views Shevardnadze Trip to Africa *[Moscow International]* 33
Post-Independence Security Fears for Namibia Noted *[IZVESTIYA 22 Mar]* 33
Commentary Links Namibian Peace, Area Stability *[Moscow International]* 34
Solton Commentary Examines Namibian Independence *[Moscow International]* 34
Namibian Minister Queried on Reconciliation *[TASS]* 35
Radio on Stronger Ties Between USSR, Tanzania *[Moscow International]* 35

East Europe

Modrow Interviewed on PDS Election Results *[IZVESTIYA 22 Mar]* 36
PDS Chairman Gregory Gysi Grants Interview *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 25 Mar]* 37
GDR's De Maiziere Queried on Unification *[TASS]* 38
Post-Election Questions Remain on Unification *[IZVESTIYA 23 Mar]* 39
Accord Signed for Servicemen's Families in GDR *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 21 Mar]* 39
GDR's Modrow Sends Congratulations to Gorbachev *[IZVESTIYA 18 Mar]* 40
PRAVDA Views 'Crisis' in Yugoslav Party *[25 Mar]* 40
Slovene Opposition to Yugoslav Federation Noted *[IZVESTIYA 22 Mar]* 41
Yugoslav Leader Greets Gorbachev on Election *[IZVESTIYA 18 Mar]* 41
Yugoslav Dissident on Yugoslavia, East Europe *[NEW TIMES No 10]* 42
Iliescu Statement on Transylvania Status Cited *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 27 Mar]* 44
Romanian Situation 'Unclear' as Trials Begin *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 23 Mar]* 44
TV, Radio Agreement Signed With Romania *[TASS]* 45
Bulgarian Communists To Vote on Party Name *[TASS]* 45
Bulgaria's Lilov Stresses Avoidance of Violence *[PRAVDA 24 Mar]* 46
'Retribution' Among East Europeans Viewed *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 13 Mar]* 46

West Europe

Reportage on Yazov's Visit to France 47
    Visit Previewed *[Moscow Radio]* 47
    Arrives in France *[TASS]* 47
    Meets Rocard, Chevenement *[TASS]* 47
Gen Omelichev Concludes Visit to UK *[TASS]* 48
'Terrorists' Damage Embassy Cars in Athens *[Moscow Radio]* 48
Bessmertnykh Receives Turkish Ambassador 14 Mar *[IZVESTIYA 14 Mar]* 48
Shipping Agreement Signed With Turkey *[TASS]* 48
IZVESTIYA Dismisses Gordiyevskiy Revelations *[IZVESTIYA 24 Mar]* 48
FRG Politicians' Warning on '4th Reich' Cited *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 24 Mar]* 49
Swedish Foreign Minister Discusses Baltic States *[Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET 22 Mar]* . 49
FRG Permitted To Inspect Military Exercise *[TASS]* 50

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet Session

Moscow TV Carries 26 Mar Supreme Soviet Session 51
    Lukyanov Chairs Session 51
    Debate on Self-Government Law Continues 51
    Bill Supported 'On the Whole' 52
    Deputies Offer Amendments 52
    'Ambiguities' Need Clarification 53
    Lithuanian Decision on Deputies Rejected 53
Supreme Soviet To Hold Joint Session 27 Mar *[Moscow Radio]* 54

Supreme Soviet Discusses Taxation Bills *[TASS]* 54
  Finance Minister Submits Tax Reform Bills *[TASS]* 55
Lithuanian Decision on Deputies Rejected *[Moscow TV]* 55
Local Self-Government Bill Discussed *[TASS]* 55
Nationalities Council Passes Bills *[TASS]* 56

Political & Social

Girenko Interviewed on Gorbachev's Role *[Moscow International]* 56
Presidential Council Appointee Views New Post *[TASS]* 56
Presidential Council Member Yarin Interviewed *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 27 Mar]* 57
Ryzhkov Discusses Presidency, Democracy *[NEW TIMES No 11]* 58
Solzhenitsyn Reads Own Works on Television *[Moscow TV]* 59
Interpol Official on USSR Affiliation *[IZVESTIYA 3 Mar]* 60
Prospects of USSR Joining Interpol Viewed *[TRUD 3 Mar]* 60
Further on Ligachev Report to Veterans on Platform *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 17 Mar]* 61
Ogarkov Elected Chairman of Veterans Group *[Moscow TV]* 61
Radio, TV Committee Head on Current Trends *[Moscow TV]* 62
Medvedev, Others View Perestroyka *[Moscow TV]* 62
Nongovernment Human Rights Commission Sought *[Moscow International]* 69
MVD Proposes Law To Protect Militiamen *[TASS]* 70
Anarchist Details Views, Goals of Group *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 9]* 70
Customs Council To Expand International Cooperation *[TASS]* 71
Moscow Center To Monitor Political Trends *[IZVESTIYA 11 Mar]* 71
Jewish Development Zone in Far East Considered *[Tokyo KYODO]* 71
Academician Discusses Shortages, Rationing *[MOSCOW NEWS No 11]* 72
Writers' Union Welcomes New Draft Statutes *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 17 Mar]* 74
PEN Centers To Publish Newspaper, Magazine *[TASS]* 74
Committee Appeals for Lenin Birthday Subbotnik *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 20 Mar]* 74
Kaluga DOSAAF Plan To Sell MIGs Debunked *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 20 Mar]* 75

Economic

Defense Industry Conversion Process Viewed *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 16 Mar]* 75
Export of Agricultural Products Examined *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 10 Mar]* 77

Scientific

Supervision Official Comments on AES Data *[IZVESTIYA 9 Mar]* 78
Marchuk Reports to Academy of Sciences Meeting *[PRAVDA 21 Mar]* 79

Military

Defense Ministry Spokesman on Army Draft *[TASS]* 84
Rear Services Chief Outlines Supply Problems *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 Mar]* 85
Yazov, Colleagues Sign Soldier's Obituary *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 25 Mar]* 87

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Vilnius Radio Carries 27 Mar Council Session 88
  Current Situation Assessed 88
  Hospital Raid Discussed 88
Landsbergis Addresses 27 Mar Council Session *[Vilnius Radio]* 88
Demonstration Begins Outside Party Building *[Stockholm Radio]* 89
Reportage on Seizure of Party Buiding, Hospital 90
  Occupation of Building Confirmed *[East Berlin ADN]* 90
  Army Seizes Deserters *[AFP]* 90
  Health Minister on Hospital Raid *[Vilnius Radio]* 90
  Radio Reports Seizure of Building *[Vilnius Radio]* 91
  Landsbergis Protests *[Vilnius Radio]* 91

Landsbergis Discusses Gorbachev Role in Events *[AFP]* 91
Landsbergis on 'Collusion' Between Moscow, West *[AFP]* 92
Landsbergis Appeals to West for Help *[Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network]* 92
General Defends Seizure of Lithuanian Deserters *[TASS]* 93
    Interviewed on Situation *[PRAVDA 27 Mar]* 93
Further Soviet Army Actions in Lithuania *[AFP]* 94
Mounting Tension in Lithuania Examined *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 27 Mar]* 94
Party Secretary Discusses Building Takeovers *[TASS]* 95
Moscow on 'Untruthful Information' in Lithuania *[Moscow International]* 95
Brazauskas Interviewed on Situation in Lithuania *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 25 Mar]* 96
Yazov Says Problem Will Be 'Settled Peacefully' *[AFP]* 100
Vilnius Radio Carries 26 Mar Council Session 100
    Landsbergis Addresses Council 100
    Minister of Culture Appointed 100
    Power Supplies Discussed 100
Landsbergis Addresses 26 Mar Council Session *[Vilnius Radio]* 101
Supreme Council Appoints Lozoraitis as Envoy *[Vilnius International]* 104
Lithuanian Coordinating Council Proposed *[Vilnius Radio]* 104
Landsbergis Appeals to Russians in Lithuania *[Vilnius International]* 104
General Outlines Army's Tasks in Lithuania *[Moscow TV]* 104
First Issue of Communist Party Organ Published *[TASS]* 105
    Editor Interviewed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 27 Mar]* 105
Lithuanian Central Committee Plenum Opens *[TASS]* 106
    More on Plenum *[Vilnius International]* 107
Lithuanian Communist Parties Meet, View Situation *[Moscow TV]* 107
Lithuanian Premier on Independence, Conflict *[Hamburg DIE WELT 26 Mar]* 107
Christian Democratic Party Registers in Lithuania *[TASS]* 108
Documentary Explores History of Baltic States *[Moscow TV]* 109
Estonian Party Leader Calls for Independence *[Budapest Radio]* 110
Girenko Says Estonian Party Split Not 'Dramatic' *[PRAVDA 27 Mar]* 110
Further on 'Heated' Estonian Congress Debates *[Moscow TV]* 111
Estonian Congress Ends; Loyalist Faction Formed *[Moscow Radio]* 111
Pensions Urged for Estonians Who Served in SS *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 24 Mar]* 112
Estonia, Latvia View Support for Lithuania *[Vilnius International]* 112
Riga Mayor Chosen Ending Long Dispute *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 14 Mar]* 113
Council of Europe Delegation Visits Latvia *[IZVESTIYA 17 Mar]* 113

RSFSR

Results of Second Round of RSFSR Elections *[TASS]* 113
Democratic Rossiya Wins Seats in City Councils *[Moscow International]* 113
Karachayevo-Cherkess Oblast Officials Elected *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 25 Mar]* 113
Coal Industry Minister Loses Vorkuta Election *[TASS]* 114
Participants in Moscow Democracy Rally Polled *[MOSCOW NEWS No 8-9]* 114
Vlasov Addresses Trade Union Congress *[TASS]* 115

Western Republics

Ukraine Elects 442 of 450 People's Deputies *[Moscow Radio]* 115
Ukrainian CP Examines Letter to Rukh Members *[Moscow Radio]* 116
Ukrainian Party Secretariat Discusses Rukh Appeal *[Kiev International]* 116
'Radical' Deputies Taking Power in Lvov *[Moscow International]* 116
Lvov Rally for Lithuania Draws 'Tens of Thousands' *[Moscow International]* 116
Sevastopol Entry Restrictions Lifted *[Moscow Radio]* 117
Moldavian Front Official Interviewed *[SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA 22 Feb]* 117
'Deterioration' of Situation in Moldavia *[Moscow Radio]* 118
Localized State of Emergency Threatened *[IZVESTIYA 27 Mar]* 118

Caucasus

Bus Attacked in Nagorno-Karabakh; 1 Killed *[TASS]* ... 119
Fadeyev Appealed to on Train Bombing *[Moscow TV]* ... 119
Further on Azerbaijan-Armenian Border Situation ... 119
  Azerbaijan Condemns Attacks *[Baku Radio]* ... 119
  Armenia's Arutyunyan Interviewed *[Moscow TV]* ... 120
  Yerevan Refutes TASS *[Yerevan Radio]* ... 120
Radio Liberty's Reports on Azerbaijan Criticized *[Baku Radio]* ... 121

Central Asia

New Uzbek Council of Ministers Chairman Named *[TASS]* ... 121
Kazakhstan Election Results Reported *[TASS]* ... 121

U.S. Persistence With SDI Programs Deplored

PM2203147290 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 22 Mar 90 First Edition p 3

[Manki Ponomarev "Observer's Column": "Death-like Grip on SDI"]

[Text] It was a time of acute political confrontation, military opposition, and an unrestrained arms race. Official Washington called our country none other than the "evil empire." We did not remain in debt either, ruthlessly "exposing imperialism" and ascribing to it all sins conceivable and inconceivable, imaginary and real. In short, black storm clouds were gathering on the world's horizon.

Under those conditions seven years ago, on 23 March 1983, then U.S. President Reagan delivered an impassioned speech. In it he announced that the United States would begin work on creating [sozdaniye] a large-scale ABM system with space-based elements, which he there and then called the "Strategic Defense Initiative." That name became established on a par with another, more emotional one which undoubtedly corresponded better with the essence of the matter: "Star Wars."

The SDI program was initially proclaimed as a program to fully protect the United States from the danger of nuclear missile weapons—Soviet, of course—and as a program to rid mankind of such weapons because their future use would be rendered pointless. In fact, this was pure demagoguery. SDI's initiators and apologists saw it as a long-awaited opportunity to achieve overwhelming military superiority over the Soviet Union and, at the same time, to make fabulous profits for the military-industrial corporations.

The preparations for "Star Wars" were only just beginning, but the whole danger of it had already become obvious to the world—and not just the danger. Right from the start SDI hindered the adoption of very important political decisions—as happened at Reykjavik, for example. At the same time it was becoming increasingly clear right from the start that there was a mass of speculations in that program—undoubtedly a very serious program. Its authors were reckoning that the Soviet Union would take the same path and would collapse beneath the weight of an unbearable financial burden. It soon became clear, however, that the USSR could make an asymmetric reply to SDI—far less costly and very effective. It also came to light that the most important technical decisions on which the whole program was based, particularly the creation [sozdaniye] of an X-ray laser, were unsound, to put it mildly. It no longer seemed possible even to the United States to realize SDI in the form in which Reagan had proclaimed it. Nor, obviously, necessary. The cold war was receding into the past, the new political thinking was being asserted, and the myth of the "Soviet military threat" vanished.

Nevertheless, the United States decided not to abandon SDI even when G. Bush entered the White House. "I will vigorously seek to implement SDI," the president declared. He was echoed by Defense Secretary R. Cheney: "I still consider SDI the most promising contribution in the military sphere."

Of course, life has caused a number of this program's ambitious projects to be abandoned. New ones have been drawn up to replace them. One of them is "brilliant pebbles." It is essentially proposed to put into orbit around the earth toward the end of the nineties thousands of small ABM interceptors—only approximately one meter long—equipped with thermal homing heads capable of detecting an enemy strategic ballistic missile at long distance and destroying it by means of a direct hit on its body. It is thought that this project will cost appreciably less than the previous ones (although, according to U.S. specialists' own estimates, this "less" will still be more than $100 billion) and has a perfectly realistic chance of being put into practice from the technical viewpoint.

It is precisely this feasibility and, in fact, the high cost of "brilliant pebbles" that make these "pebbles" particularly attractive to some people in the United States. To make a huge profit out of their production and to ensure relative U.S. invulnerability in the nuclear missile war for which they are continuing to prepare there even today, thereby blackmailing the Soviet Union—this is what Washington is counting on. This is why certain U.S. circles have seized hold of the SDI program in a death-like grip and refuse even to hear of abandoning it.

Reportage on 7th Anniversary of SDI

Opponents, Supporters

LD2203134490 Moscow TASS in English 1312 GMT 22 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 22 TASS—By TASS military analyst Vladimir Chernyshev:

Today marks the 7th anniversary of the Strategic Defence Initiative, established in 1983 by Ronald Reagan. It has won no cheers but provoked lots of emotion.

Even Pentagon chief Richard Cheney had to admit that the SDI programme is at a cross-roads and disputes about it are becoming political.

It seems that the claims of American SDI opponents are quite justified: Recent developments—radical changes in the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Treaty Organisation, the disappearance of the "enemy image", a real chance to achieve a Soviet-U.S. agreement on cuts in strategic offensive weapons at the Geneva negotiations—have made the strategic defence systems pointless.

Little remains of the initial plans to create an "inpenetrable shield" after years of SDI resarch. Only an air-defence system with limited capabilities is now being discussed.

SDI supporters have long pinned their hopes on "exotic" weapons, primarily laser ones. The newest are conventional missiles placed on space platforms. They advertised the SDI as a way to eliminate nuclear arms, and are now frankly describing it as an addition to strategic offensive weapons, which "must be modernised."

The popularity of the SDI has sharply dropped among Americans, who understand that the "space shield" will prove to be "holey". According to an opinion poll, the two-thirds of those polled prefer arms reduction to "Star Wars".

The U.S. Congress is increasingly critical of the "Strategic Defence Initiative". It is getting harder for the Pentagon to persuade law-makers to allocate money for the programme.

Nevertheless the American leadership is surprisingly insistent about supporting the SDI and calling for higher rates of its fulfilment.

Cheney has said that President Bush and he are "determined" to deploy strategic defence systems as soon as they are ready.

Frankly speaking, the inconsistency of the U.S. leadership in "justifying" the need for the SDI is surprising. The leadership holds that it will make "a unique contribution" to the restraint of aggression.

Does this mean that the "nuclear restraint" prioritized by Washington for decades and preserved by all U.S. administrations is not efficient? Otherwise why supplement it with a space restraint system?

'New Demands To Speed It Up'

LD2503070490 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 24 Mar 90

[Weekly "Moscow Viewpoint" commentary, by political observer Valentin Zorin]

[Text] The seventh anniversary of the Strategic Defense Initiative, or the Star Wars program, has been marked in the Pentagon by new demands to speed it up. The defense secretary, Richard Cheney, has announced that the system will be deployed in space as soon as it's ready. That should be puzzling to many Americans. By concerted efforts, our two countries have created a situation least alarming since the Second World War. As Cheney is doing his best to push through Congress new (?billions of) allocations for the SDI, both Washington and Moscow are preparing for the upcoming summit meeting. Agreements are expected to be signed during the meeting to constitute a breakthrough in the principal directions of arms controls.

The situation in the world is different from what it was seven years ago—when Ronald Reagan advanced the SDI idea. He defended then the heavy cost of the program and the immense resources involved by a need to use nuclear missiles to repulse a possible Soviet attack. He said the risk of such an attack far exceeded the risk of an SDI failure. He argued that national security was worth any expense.

And now, can anyone in Washington claim that America faces an imminent threat of a Soviet nuclear attack? I can safely state that no one will venture such an allegation. Why then should the Pentagon (?court) so obstinately at the SDI program and resist all attempts to switch the expenditure of billions of dollars over to civilian purposes? What moral, political, or just logical justification can be found for that?

In fact, the political situation in the world has radically improved in the past seven years, but the SDI burden is still weighing on the United States budget. Besides, the past years have shown the technical inadequacy of the SDI program. The original idea of a completely safe umbrella for America and its allies against a nuclear attack had to be given up. It has been modified to a partial protection, but the program is still carried on. Though it can't be the much-vaunted shield for the country, billions of dollars are still spent on it annually.

The Pentagon is taking that expenditure for granted. The defense corporations, extracting huge profits from the government orders, are also taking them for granted, but can the American taxpayers take for granted a program that goes contrary to the technical or just common sense?

Krasnoyarsk Radar Station's Future Considered

PM2203161090 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 11, 18 Mar 90 p 6

[Interview with retired Major General Boris Surikov by Aleksandr Makhov; date, place not given: "Black for White"— first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] **The Krasnoyarsk radar should never have been built, but to dismantle it seems unreasonable too**

Eduard Shevardnadze recently told the Supreme Soviet that the USSR would dismantle the Krasnoyarsk radar, built in contravention of the ABM Treaty. It seemed that the passions surrounding this "heroine" of the dramatic collisions of the 1980s were coming to naught, but then suddenly LITERATURNAYA GAZETA (No. 4, 1990) called for the radar station not be be dismantled. What's going on? Are the "hawks" again trying to create tensions in Soviet-American relations, or...? We decided to query the author of that controversial article. Major-General (ret.) Boris Surikov, an expert who attended many of Soviet-U.S. negotiations, now works at the USSR Academy of Sciences' Institute of the United States and Canada:

[Surikov] I believe that the dismantling of the Krasnoyarsk radar would lower the security level not only of the USSR, but of the United States as well. This facility is not designed to attack ABM missions (as has been recognized in a Congress resolution) and thus, presents no threat to the United States. The Krasnoyarsk radar is merely an information element in a system intended to warn the country of a likely missile-attack from the north-east, in which case it would seem that both sides would be vitally interested in these national systems being reliable. Today control over the north-eastern sector (121 degrees) is carried out by space information systems which, regrettably, often sounds false alarms. I myself witnessed a facility receive such a signal from space: a missile attack against the USSR from the Grand Forks base. Patches of sunlight were mistaken for American missiles. It's good that the panel had a competent operator who instantly sized up the situation. There have been many such false alarms in the USSR. Therefore, if we dismantle the Krasnoyarsk radar, we will have to build two new ones—along our border. This will cost us an estimated one to three billion rubles and construction—due to the remoteness and the lack of an infrastructure—will take at least ten to 15 years during which time we will have no reliable warning system. It was madness to build the Krasnoyarsk radar in contravention of the 1972 Treaty, but I think it is unreasonable for eveyone's point of view to dismantle it now.

[Makhov] But isn't it unfeasible to keep the radar intact? For years the USSR claimed falsely that the facility under construction near Krasnyarsk did not violate the ABM Treaty. Later we invited American congressmen to visit the mysterious facility, and they were supposed to believe that it was just a satellite-tracking station. We palmed off black for white thus setting both Congress and the American public against our radar. This is evidently why Shevardnadze said it should be dismantled....

[Surikov] You are right in that it will be extremely difficult to restore trust. And yet we must act. The destiny of humankind is at stake. The U.S. Congress has repeatedly discussed our radar. Such hearings should be carried out in the Supreme Soviet as well. It may be advisable for our parliamentary committee on questions of defence and state security to address the American colleagues. I am personally acquainted with many American legislators. I am sure that people like Les Asprin or Sam Nunn are capable of overcoming their feeling of the wrong done to them in the name of common sense. We are becoming a more open society with every passing day. Why then shouldn't we pose the question of an international warning system? The Krasnoyarsk radar with an international staff could be part of such a system.

[Makhov] I feel like we are still brandishing our fists after the fight. But how did that fight start? Did the people who ordered the radar to be build know nothing about the ABM Treaty?

[Surikov] What happened was standard for those times when major state decisions were taken behind closed doors, against the laws of common sense, but proceeding from the immediate requirements of different ministries. The recommendations of research centres were disregarded, competence was suppressed, but then the "phone call right" was in operation to defend departmental interests which were sometimes petty to the point of being ridiculous: I don't want to give building money to a different department. I will only build where there are construction facilities of my own, and not where it is necessary, etc. The army-wise men simply issued an order—consider the Krasnoyarsk radar to be a satellite-tracking station.

[Makhov] The brass hats, as we all know, are not diplomats and can afford such naive straightforwardness. But then weren't they controlled by anyone? Wasn't this known at the Council of Ministers, at the Central Committee, at the Foreign Ministry?

[Surikov] Each of these organizations had a departmental lobby. It is out of the latter that representative commissions were appointed, and they drew the necessary conclusions, which were always final. We had no independent state commissions of experts. And this situation has not changed. Such mistakes could well be repeated today.

Bacteriological Weapons Ban Convention Noted

LD2503144990 Moscow TASS in English 1438 GMT 25 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 25 TASS—TASS military news analyst Vladimir Bogachev writes:

The convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of bacteriological (biological) and toxin weapons and on their destruction entered into force 15 years ago, on March 26, 1975.

That was history's first agreement on full withdrawal of a whole category of the most dangerous weapons of mass destruction from military arsenals.

More than 100 countries have acceded to the convention. The Soviet Union and the United States at one time announced the fulfilment of their obligations under the convention.

Bacteriological weapons are one of the most treacherous weapons of mass destruction. A report prepared by the United Nations experts as far as 1969 pointed out that one heavy bomber carrying containers with bacteria of plague, cholera, typhus, anthrax or other diseases may affect unprotected population on an area of 100,000 square kilometres.

Nowadays, as a result of discoveries in the field of gene engineering, the potential for such destruction has grown many times over. To be more exact, the scope of disaster in the event of the development and use of bacteriological weapons is now utterly unpredictable.

The risk connected with such a possibility is too great and the countries that are parties to the convention continue to work to refine the system of control over non-production of bacteriological weapons.

International conferences dealing with the observance of the accord about banning bacteriological weapons were held in 1980 and 1986. Scientific and technological experts met in 1987 to work out specific measures to monitor activities that may have a bearing on bacteriological weapons.

The countries that are parties to the convention agreed in particular to annually submit information to the U.N. secretariat about laboratories where viral research is conducted, about the level of shielding of these research institutions, their funding, and so on.

Each country now reports outbreaks of epidemics on its territory and provides proofs that the outbreaks are not connected with the production of bacteriological weapons. They exchange articles published in the press on biological subjects and report seminars and symposiums on bacteriology. The problems of compliance with the convention on bacteriological weapons are discussed from time to time at meetings of the leaders of the signatory countries.

Preparations are now under way for a third conference to review the operation of the convention banning bacteriological weapons. The conference is expected to be held in the middle of 1991.

The elaboration of a new effective mechanism to monitor compliance with the convention with an eye to the latest scientific discoveries in biology, gene engineering, in particular, is expected to become the main subject of discussion at the conference.

It seems advisable for such forum to envisage such measures to verify compliance with the convention as on-site and challenge inspections that have already justified themselves during the implementation of other arms control accords.

NATO's Woerner Cited on Deterrence, Security

PM2603122790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Mar 90 First Edition p 1

[TASS report: "NATO and the Disarmament Process in Europe"]

[Text] Bonn, 25 Mar—The importance of the forthcoming exchange of opinions on disarmament and security problems in Europe with the Soviet partners in Moscow was emphasized by NATO Secretary General M. Woerner in an interview published by BILD AM SONNTAG today. According to him, the talks will focus mainly on questions associated with the creation of a new security system in Europe. We want to transform the work which began with the all-European conference in Helsinki and the disarmament process into an overall European security structure, M. Woerner emphasized.

In his opinion, the role of "load-bearing structure" should be played by the North Atlantic alliance, but one increasingly geared to the performance of political tasks in cooperation, monitoring in the arms sphere, and the solution of other problems. As for the Warsaw Pact, its future ought to be decided "in conditions of free self-determination by its member states themselves," according to the NATO secretary general.

While also advocating a sharp reduction in nuclear arms, the secretary general at the same time emphasized that the question of "total renunciation of nuclear arms" is not at issue for NATO. We want to prevent any war, and this requires a minimum quantity of such weapons, M. Woerner pointed out, repeating the familiar argument according to which nuclear weapons supposedly render any war pointless.

In the event of Germany's unification, according to him, NATO does not intend to deploy its forces on the territory of today's GDR. We will respect the legitimate interests of USSR security, M. Woerner said.

Chernyshev Analyzes NATO Need To Alter Policy

LD2603141490 Moscow TASS in English 1315 GMT 26 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 26 TASS—By TASS military news analyst Vladimir Chernyshev:

Prime Minister Michel Rocard of France, in an interview with TIME magazine, stated that NATO was essential "to maintain pressure at talks on disarmament."

Current reductions in the armed forces and armaments of the Warsaw Treaty countries, the elimination of U.S. and Soviet intermediate- and shorter-range missiles and headway at the Vienna talks on conventional armed forces in Europe illustrate radical changes in the "Euro-strategic landscape" and make it possible to judge realistically whether or not there is any need to "maintain pressure" at the talks.

In terms of the spectrum of suggested subjects at the talks and of the depth and magnitude of steps to lower military confrontation, NATO members are clearly not as active as the Soviet Union and its allies.

For example, the Soviet Union considers it advisable and essential to begin talks on tactical nuclear weapons in Europe—the foundation of the common European home should hardly be laid on a nuclear "minefield."

Unfortunately, NATO countries still reject such a forum. Certain individual officials spokesmen for the West now recognize the advisability of such talks, but on the whole the North Atlantic alliance is not ready to respond positively to the Soviet proposal.

Talks on naval forces are making no headway. NATO countries not only refuse to negotiate cuts in naval forces but do not want to apply confidence-building measures to the navies of the participating states at the VIENNA CSCE follow-up forum.

At the United Nations General Assembly's third session on disarmament, the Soviet Union put forward an official proposal to eliminate foreign military presence and military bases on other peoples' territories by the year 2000.

However, in this field NATO countries have also remained quiet, with one exception—a U.S. proposal to lower the levels of the Soviet Union's and the United States' troops in central Europe.

I think it is time to take stock of problems at the NATO headquarters and in the capitals of NATO countries.

The West must take a new look at changes taking place in Europe and around the world in order to find NATO's place in the changing world. Then NATO will be able to make an impressive contribution to the process of disarmament and the strengthening of stability.

Readers Reassured on Defense Capability

PM2603151990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 24 Mar 90 First Edition p 5

[Colonel V. Markushin report: "Let Us Not Lose Our Way By Moving Too Fast"]

[Text] Looking through the readers' mailbag recently, the same reproach to the current political leadership was to be found frequently: Isn't it too compliant, they ask; hasn't it lost its way under the influence of the events in Europe? It is primarily people from the older generation, who have acquired worldly wisdom and who are unwilling to part with their usual view of the world around them, that express such unease. Their motives for writing are not difficult to understand: They firmly believe that they will be understood in a military newspaper rather than any other newspaper.

What is it that worries these readers, who are undoubtedly expressing the views of a significant section of society? Of course, it is the country's security. It is difficult to doubt the sincerity of their feelings—indeed there is a specific reason for these feelings. The situation in Europe is presenting us, and will obviously continue to present us, with great surprises in the future. Therefore, when expressing my opinion on the subject in question, the last thing I want to do is to find something nice and reassuring to say, like: Don't worry, dear citizens, everything will be all right, our ship is traveling along the right course.

And so, what about this "compliance which is undermining our security?" In my view, this is the syndrome of belief in the infallibility of the excessively "tough" Soviet foreign policy of past years. You know, such a deep-rooted habit of viewing top statesmen as unshakable, wise teachers who are the absolute authority about the way not just their own people, but neighboring peoples as well should live.

But then the time of perestroyka came, and the new leadership renounced the ultimate "right" to the truth and the tone of mentor in relations with allies. It renounced these things in the firm conviction that both our prestige and our security can only gain thereby. In essence, the moral principles of foreign policy were reexamined in a cardinal way. And they were undoubtedly reexamined so that they would be as honest and realistic as possible.

People object: "Honesty is all very well, but the USSR's relations with East European countries are very destabilized, the Warsaw Pact in its previous form now only exists for form's sake. And to a certain extent they would be right. Although, to be honest, I do not see that as a tragedy. After all, there were differences between us, and they were growing—that is reality. The explosion occurred with our participation, that is, under the influence of perestroyka. A qualitative leap forward, as is laid down in the law of dialectics, was taken quickly, and reality determined consciousness. And now the human mind is working intensely in order to get its bearings and work out new attitudes that correspond to new realities.

In first place is a problem that affects everyone's interests—that is, security and stability. It has become obvious that the new situation marks the beginning of the process of gradually overcoming the division of Europe. This promises to be difficult, but nevertheless a general desire to determine new structures exists. European social thought is rejecting bloc stereotypes more and more frequently and is getting increasingly involved in the quest for a qualitatively new image of collective security. Hitherto unknown concepts have appeared in the press: a "European security council," a "European military council" and so on. People have started talking about the future of the blocs and their transformation. Military specialists and scientists who look into the future are obviously already thinking up fundamental restructurings of certain concepts on which security has been constructed hitherto and which will turn out to be in opposition to the new realities.

Naturally, not everyone intends to carry out restructuring with the same resoluteness. This, for example, is the opinion of NATO Secretary General M. Woerner on the advisability of preserving a strategy of "flexible response": "We must not renounce the principles of the flexible response strategy, which consist in a combination of conventional and nuclear forces. We are now thinking over the concept of security based on minimum deterrence. I hope that we may even reach an agreement on this question with the USSR." Woerner also believes that the number of tactical nuclear weapons can be considerably reduced, and the meaning of the concept "the defense of frontline borders" somewhat modified, while preserving the principle itself.

The idea of a common Europe is naturally at the center of all European matters. Initially perceived by many as something rather improbable if all European countries without exception were to be included, it is now becoming concrete and is being seen as a universal way of resolving the problem of common European security. It is a road that leads to an association in which peoples will stop fearing one another and start to live in complete trust. Such an idea is made possible not by abstract, theoretical constructions, but by life itself. It shows, on the one hand, the artificial and academic nature of ideological disputes, which simply prevent the two parts of Europe from coexisting normally, and, on the other, their growing mutual dependence in resolving large-scale tasks such as the arms race situation, the prevention of environmental disaster, space exploration, the fight against crime, and so on.

It stands to reason that it would be hasty to make predictions with respect to future European security based solely on positive preconditions. Now the German question has risen to its full height on the agenda. The so-called internal aspects of the unification of the two German states can be considered resolved in principle. But there are also the external aspects, which directly affect the security of Germany's neighboring countries and peoples. For example, they will have to clearly define their position on the status of foreign troops on the territory of a united Germany, the way the postwar borders will be guaranteed, and generally what to do about having both Soviet and, for instance, American divisions coexisting in one country.

As is well known, it has been decided that the foreign aspects of the problem will be worked out at the "two plus four" talks, that is, with the participation of the FRG, the GDR, the United States, the USSR, Britain, and France. The preparation for them has already begun. The first meeting at expert level was held in Bonn. Subsequent meetings will be held in the GDR and the FRG in turn.

It must be assumed that a great deal of the further development of the European process will depend on the success of the six powers' talks and their drawing up of a common policy on the German question. Let us imagine: Will this promote gradual rapprochement between the

Warsaw Pact and NATO and the creation of an "alliance of alliances" or, on the contrary, will phenomena and aspects appear that are difficult to predict and that will destabilize the situation.

Whatever happens, we need on the one hand careful, well-considered steps and, on the other, quick decisions and an ability to look ahead and not just to consolidate what has already happened. Moving rapidly in the current circumstances is not someone's whim, but an objective reality. With all these sharp about-faces, it is important to keep one's bearings clear in time and space, so to speak, understanding that we are at the watershed of two eras in international relations.

And of course, not forgetting the fact that security means our Army—up-to-date, professionally trained, ready for anything. The Soviet Government is changing the priorities in its methods for preserving peace, but at the same time, is not diminishing the defense capability factor at all—a fact that was expressed in USSR President M.S. Gorbachev's speech at the extraorindary Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

Gerasimov Gives Briefing on Development Bank

PM2603154190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Report from correspondent G. Charodeyev at the USSR Foreign Ministry press center: "Seeking a Sensible Compromise"]

[Text] G. Gerasimov, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration, has addressed a routine briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists. He stressed that the Soviet Union backs the idea of creating a European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

"We believe that in the future the bank could be one of the new structures of European cooperation. Talks are continuing on the bank. The USSR is participating in them and sees the possibility of a sensible compromise, free from the sides' dogmatic beliefs. This would make it possible to eliminate the contradictions that arose at the Paris meeting on the elaboration of documents regulating the setting up of the bank."

"What worries us," he continued, "is U.S. officials' desire to politicize the agreement and introduce discriminatory provisions against the USSR restricting our access to the future bank's resources. During the talks a number of delegations voiced fears that the Soviet Union—a big country with a vast economy—that the Soviet Union might be the main recipient of the bank's credit. This would 'offend' other countries, they said, and reduce their chances of obtaining credit. But this would not be in our interests. The Soviet Union stresses that its intention to participate in the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development is dictated primarily by a desire to create a new institution of multilateral cooperation in which everyone will have equal rights and equal obligations. Committed, as it is, to ensuring the multilateral character of the bank, the Soviet Union will not be seeking to upset the balanced distribution of the bank's credit facilities among the recipients. We assume that in the event of a request to the bank during the setting-up period, which will last for several years, our country will receive credit in an amount not exceeding the total Soviet commitment to the bank's capital."

"The Soviet Union is also sure that the process of promoting economic reforms and strengthening the bank's resources will eventually create objective prerequisites for the expansion of the bank's activities on USSR territory."

M. Streltsov, USSR representative on the Soviet-American special verification commission, also spoke. "In recent days," he said, "officials and the media in the United States have raised the question of the use of the 'Cargoscan' inspection apparatus in the implementation of the Soviet-American Treaty on Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles. (See IZVESTIYA No. 77—editor's note). Often what they say is biased and sometimes it is simply implausible. In accordance with the protocol on inspections, which is an integral part of the Treaty on Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, the U.S. side has the right to set up at the entrance to the Votkinsk machine building plant a device to obtain by a safe method (in this case, using an X-ray source) an image of the contents of the launch canisters or shipping containers leaving the plant in railroad cars. The device will be used to verify the Soviet side's implementation of the treaty pledge not to produce SS-20 medium-range missiles. The specifications and methods of using the U.S. 'Cargospan' apparatus in respect of the SS-25 missile, manufactured in Votkinsk, were agreed on within the framework of the Soviet-American special verification commission."

"But as a result of experiments carried out in February by Soviet specialists, with the participation of a U.S. inspection group, following the installation of the 'Cargoscan' apparatus, it was established that in certain fundamentally important technical parameters it does not conform to the provisions of the verification memorandum. It is primarily a question of the limits of the area of the second stage of the SS-25 missile exposed to rays, as a result of which U.S. inspectors would gain access to additional information that has nothing to do with the purpose of the inspection. This caused disagreements," M. Streltsov said. "There was a meeting of Soviet and U.S. experts in Votkinsk last week to discuss them. As a result the U.S. side made some alterations to the apparatus and to the functioning of the 'Cargoscan' system, thereby removing the Soviet side's anxiety. Following an experiment by Soviet specialists to check the alterations, the 'Cargoscan' apparatus was put into operation and is being used during inspections entirely in accordance with the provisions of the verification memorandum."

Stability Paramount in German Settlement

PM2603145990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Aleksandr Bovin "Political Observer's Opinion": "Europe, Germany, and Us..."]

[Text] Europe is approaching the end of the 20th century in an atmosphere of major change. It is not only the political configuration of the region and the alignment of political forces that are changing. History will go deeper. The model of socialism which arose in the Soviet Union and was duplicated in neighboring countries after 1945 will collapse before our eyes.

It must be stressed that all these changes, all these historic transformations are unfolding against the backdrop of a steady lessening of international tension, ever-increasing disarmament, and a clear reluctance on the part of Europeans to return to the period of confrontation and "cold war."

The end of postwar Europe represents a kind of "peaceful explosion," whose tremendous energy has facilitated something that quite recently seemed impossible and inconceivable, beyond the bounds of political (and psychological) possibility. I am referring to German unification.

The unification process, which has already begun and which nothing will be able to stop, is generating a great host of questions—large and small. The main one, the most important one being: What kind of system of political and legal measures can and should guarantee Europe against a revival of German militarism? What can and must be done to ensure that a united Germany is always a factor for peace, a source of stability on the European continent? This question generally boils down to the military-political status of a united Germany: Will it be a member of NATO or will it remain outside the blocs—will it be neutral?

At first glance the option of a neutral Germany with a reduced level of arms and armed forces is clearly preferable. A seat of peace and stability at the center of Europe. But let us take a more attentive look.

Germany is not Austria or Switzerland. It is not hard to imagine, despite statements to the contrary, the beginning of a dogged, more often concealed than overt, struggle within and outside Germany to render it less neutral in essence, while preserving German neutrality in form, and to direct German interests toward a particular side. This tug-of-war would be a constant source of suspicion and fear, a source of quarrels and conflict situations.

But people raise objections to what I have said, saying that there will be no place in a durable "common European home," where all the inhabitants are united by mutually beneficial cooperation and where good-neighborliness and trust will prevail, for rivalry or for attempts to undermine German neutrality. I cannot argue with that. But the point is that in real historical time German unification will occur considerably earlier than the "common European home" will be set up.

Of course, my arguments are hypothetical ones. But hypotheses perfectly in tune with real processes and relations.

Now for another scenario. A united Germany becomes a member of NATO.

It goes without saying that this turn of events will do us moral and political damage since it will emphasize and throw into relief a major foreign policy defeat for us. But let us be frank and sincere, at least with ourselves, let us not be afraid of harsh but accurate definitions. After all, the impending transformation of the GDR is a detail, a consequence of more general, extensive progress in Europe. We are being forced—I use the terminology of the old political thinking—to "leave" the part of Europe which we were accustomed to consider "ours"; we are taking our troops out of there and allowing every people to choose their own path, their own destiny. Even if that choice is not to our liking.

Ultimately—here I switch to the new political thinking—the renunciation of coercive tutelage over our neighbors is a victory for common sense, a victory for our long-term strategic interests, a victory for democracy. But in order to reach this "end result" we must smash and overcome many habitual stereotypes, we must stop looking at the world today and tomorrow from the viewpoint of yesteryear.

Let us take a glance at the map. The inclusion in NATO territory of the current territory of the GDR can hardly have any appreciable effect on our security. Admittedly, we must listen to the "lessons of the past." However, let us not forget that in the nuclear age comparisons with 1914, 1939, and 1941 have all become meaningless.

A.I. Adzhubey's memoirs "Those Ten Years" cites the following episode. N.S. Khrushchev was talking with journalists from the FRG. They asked the following question: How many missiles are needed to destroy the FRG. Khrushchev telephoned someone, made an inquiry, and gave the following reply: "Seven!" The figure may of course change. The crux of the matter is still the same.

It would hardly be right to consider a particular option for Germany's status in the light of whether it upsets the NATO-Warsaw Pact military-strategic balance or not. First, this balance is extremely stable and it is hard to imagine a geopolitical movement that would produce an imbalance. Second, it is in itself somewhat late to be raising the question of balance between NATO and the Warsaw Pact. This balance will be upset and is already being upset, regardless of Germany's potential status.

The Warsaw Pact has ceased to be an organization of "fraternal" states, that is, states adhering to a common ideological and political platform. Interests have lost the cementing effect of ideology. "Naked" political calculation has taken center stage.

This calculation will hardly strengthen the alliance-policy commitments within the Warsaw Pact. Rather, the contrary.

In the opinion of Hungary's Foreign Minister Gyula Horn, while remaining a member of the Warsaw Pact, Hungary could quite easily take part in the work of NATO political bodies.

Czechoslovak Foreign Minister Jiri Dienstbier has already paid an unofficial visit to NATO headquarters. The NATO leadership has decided to establish 60 scholarships in West European universities for Czechoslovak students. I would venture to say that from the point of view of "balance" these 60 scholarships are more important than 60 missiles....

We have gotten accustomed to looking after ourselves and not speaking about ourselves in strict, ruthless terms.... We still often look at events in East Europe in some kind of sentimental light. How is that? They are brother Slavs. Hundreds of thousands of us died—that was the price of our liberation from fascism. And there is our postwar cooperation, exchange of experience, and mass contacts. Millions of Soviet people probably have close acquaintances, friends, and business partners there.

All that is true. Such feelings are understandable. But, after all, people there see us through different eyes. They see us as people associated with the stifling atmosphere of "barrack socialism"....

It is time to escape from the diktat of feelings and illusions. We are faced with a new and by no means always friendly reality. Our policy, our new policy must take this into consideration so that we do not labor under any delusions or set ourselves impracticable tasks, and so as to ensure that we correlate our hopes with what is possible. In particular, we should get into the habit of considering our future security, avoiding the customary rhetoric about the Warsaw Pact. Our state interests permit this quite easily.

But let us return to the subject of Germany. It is important to ensure that German unification does not pose a threat to peace, a threat to our security. That is, I repeat, the main thing. That is the aim of our foreign policy efforts.

But can it be claimed that a united Germany's involvement or noninvolvement in NATO "of itself" guarantees the peaceableness of a new German state? In my opinion, any unequivocal answer would be too much of an over-simplification. Consequently, perhaps we should concentrate our attention not on external, pro forma signs (its involvement or otherwise) but on those conditions which will at any rate work for European stability (recognition of borders, arms limitation, nuclear-free status, and so on).

Realizing how difficult it is for Moscow to agree to the NATO option, people in the West are discussing a number of compromise ideas. They boil down to "special military status" for the current territory of the GDR. The following scenarios has been drawn up: A united Germany becomes part of NATO, however NATO's military border runs along the current border between the FRG and the GDR. In practice this means that NATO troops, including the Bundeswehr, cannot be deployed on the territory of the current GDR. A more exotic options is for Soviet troops to remain on the aforementioned territory. J. Dienstbier made the following remark about that: "In the conditions in which we are living, with symbiosis between the good soldier Schweik, Franz Kafka, and Joseph Stalin, nothing is absurd." That is precisely the case.... After all, we use imaginary figures to obtain quite real results.

To my mind, former CIA Director Richard Helms accurately indicated the real danger. "In plain terms," he wrote in THE WASHINGTON POST, "it may be noted that German unification has begun to be reminiscent of a freight train which has gotten out of control and which no one—in either East or West—is clearly able to restrain." For domestic political reasons, Helmut Kohl is in a hurry, forcing the pace of events. Certain circles in the GDR are also geared up to this wave, as the 18 March election showed. But haste could bring unpleasant surprises.

It is said that Margaret Thatcher was not delighted by the "two plus four" formula, which means that the two (the GDR and the FRG) reach an agreement first and then their accords are examined with the involvement of the four victorious powers (the USSR, the United States, Britain, and France). London would have preferred a different order: "Four plus two." The faster the train of unification goes, the more convinced I am that people were wrong not to heed M. Thatcher. At any rate, if is still not too late, the "Four" must not wait until their "turn" comes, but get involved in German affairs in a most active fashion. Passivity today may create difficulties which will take a great deal of time and effort to overcome tomorrow.

One last thought. It is important, in my view, not to reject any possible solution and to weigh up over and over the pluses and minuses of each one. Pluses and minuses from the viewpoint of the Europe of the future rather than the Europe of yesteryear and past understanding of security.

Solton Comments on Need for European Summit

LD2603153590 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 26 Mar 90

[Yuriy Soltan commentary]

[Text] [Announcer] In an interview for the radio station Suddeutscher Rundfunk, the West German Foreign

Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher has said that disarmament is a key issue in the process of European and German unification. Yuriy Solton comments and writes the following:

This approach can be agreed with. Indeed, a sharp cut in the Armed Forces in Europe, in West Germany itself too, and the restructuring of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization with a view to giving them a largely political function would lift many suspicions that began to plague Europeans in connection with the proposed German unification. However, what we cannot agree with is the inclusion of a unified Germany into NATO, which West German officials, Hans-Dietrich Genscher among them, have mentioned as something already decided more than once.

We all hope that the Vienna talks will be concluded this very year with an agreement to reduce conventional forces in Europe. We hope that at the second stage of the talks NATO will agree to discuss issues connected with eliminating tactical nuclear weapons and limiting naval forces. But it's too early to speak about a new face of Europe before these hopes materialize. That's why it's essential to synchronize the process of promoting disarmament and changing the functions of the two military blocs with the process of German unification.

In the meantime, both the West German and NATO leaderships still think largely in terms of blocs. In evidence is a subconscious desire to use changes occurring in East European countries and in the Warsaw Treaty Organization for the purpose of deriving one-sided political and military benefits. According to NATO Secretary General Manfred Woerner, for instance, European security should lean on the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to which he thinks a unified Germany must belong.

In other words, a group of militarily and economically strong European countries in concord with the United States and Canada should be given the opportunity to dictate its will to the whole of Europe. Such an approach can hardly be conducive to easing tensions or ensuring stability. The future of Europe should be determined by the interests of all Europeans, not by those of one or another military bloc, one or another group of countries.

Therefore, in my view, writes Yuriy Solton, it's imperative to start without delay concrete preprations for holding a European summit with the involvement of the United States and Canada. At such a summit it will be possible to stipulate the politico-military status of a unified Germany and pave the way for a new phase of developing cooperation and strengthening security in Europe.

'Helsinki 2' Urged To Aid European Stability

PM2603105590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Mar 90 Second Edition p 7

[Vladislav Drobkov "View From Moscow": "Time To Beat Swords Into Plowshares"]

[Text] The changes occurring in Europe, particularly on its eastern flank, are confronting Europeans with new and, I would say, dramatic acuteness with the question of guarantees of security, stability, and peace.

Of course, some readers might disagree with this assessment: Are not such guarantees provided in themselves by the reduction which has begun in the Warsaw Pact and NATO armies confronting each other, by the destruction of Soviet and U.S. intermediate-range and shorter-range nuclear missiles, and by a whole series of measures to strengthen confidence and arrange regular contacts between politicians and military chiefs in East and West? Is the level of the threat of war in Europe not falling?

Yes, they are provided. Yes, it is falling. Yes, the "Eurostrategic" landscape has changed beyond recognition and become far more peaceful. Suspicion and even hostility are gradually giving way to mutual understanding and good-neighborliness. Only it is a strange thing that an anxious thought appears from time to time in a reader's letter or a newspaper commentary--are not the changes proceeding too fast? Is the equilibrium which has ensured stability on the continent for several decades not being upset?

What can be said in this regard? The balance of terror and the capacity of the two military-political blocs for mutual incineration in an all-out war are far from being the best guarantee of the maintenance of peace. The foundations of the common European home which is now being built must not be constructed in a nuclear "minefield." It is an extremely dangerous thing to divide Europe into two camps bristling with missiles, and the sooner this is ended, the more calmly the present and future generations will be able to live.

But still our troop trains with hardware and people and the military truck convoys which have swept home to the USSR like a wave from East European countries give rise to ambivalent assessments. The following questions are arising: How justified was our military presence outside the USSR's border for so many years? How much did it cost our people, who are by no means the richest? Finally, to what degree will the withdrawal of the troops who, so we were told, were ensuring our own security and that of our allies affect this security?

It is not easy to answer all these questions. Particularly because emotions sometimes have a substantial influence on the assessment made by the mind. For long years we welcomed the appeals being made in many West European countries to Washington to remove its troops and bases from there but, we confess, we certainly did not expect to hear the same calls in East Europe, only addressed to Moscow. Of course, to many of our people the slogan "Yanks go home!" sounds different to "Ivan go back home!" I can understand the pain of those who shed their blood, who lost relatives and friends while liberating Czech, Hungarian, and even German lands from the Hitlerite yoke, and who are now learning how our servicemen's graves are being defiled there. It is no coincidence that readers' letters to PRAVDA more and more frequently express alarm: Are the troops who are departing eastward not opening the way to a new threat from the West? Because it must not be forgotten that Nazi ideas did not vanish into shameful nonexistence along with their "godfathers" of the Third Reich. That they have produced poisonous shoots even in places where only recently people would not even hear of them.

So, should we seek grounds for slowing up the troop withdrawal? Should we "lean" on emotions, on the sacred memory of past victims, on "international duty" or adopt the U.S. experience of transferring "national interests" to foreign lands? No, such a path is unthinkable for our country, which has proclaimed the priority of common human values in its foreign policy. But it seems to me that we should not pretend, either, that nothing special is happening. Particularly as the present change in the strategic balance in Europe is being discussed animatedly by the world press. It is talking here about "the Warsaw Pact's collapse" and the possibility of "correcting" the results of World War II and the events of subsequent years already as a fait accompli.

I will not hide the fact that I am concerned at the desire of certain Western politicians to use the present situation not to bring Europeans together but to consolidate the continent's split into military camps, only under conditions more advantageous to NATO. The four decades of "cold war" and military confrontation seem to have given rise to an unusually steadfast inertia of thinking in North Atlantic capitals and to a kind of "period of stagnation," from which they are still unable to emerge there. They frequently proceed from the premise that what is bad for the Warsaw Pact is good for NATO. And vice versa. However, it seems to me that the situation in Europe has changed fundamentally, and it is time to build relations here which will be advantageous for all Europeans.

In this connection it is impossible to disagree with Belgian Foreign Minister M. Eyskens' appeal to "lay the foundations of a new order which will enable all European peoples to live in an atmosphere of peace and cooperation with due regard for the legitimate interests and the security of each of them."

I would like to hope that such sensible opinions will be backed up by specific NATO steps to reduce armed forces and arms. Particularly as the current talks in Vienna on these problems open the way for constructive accords. The intrusive calls by certain Western strategists to integrate the GDR and, if possible, other East European countries too into the NATO structures are plainly inappropriate in such a situation. Does NATO really seriously believe that such attempts can strengthen international confidence and, correspondingly, its own security?

It seems to me that a substantial reduction in the armed forces and arms of the Warsaw Pact and NATO and their nuclear arsenals to a level of reasonable defense sufficiency is possible even now. The Pentagon could even now perfectly well begin withdrawing some U.S. troops from Europe. It is even now possible to remove tactical nuclear weapons from a broad corridor along the borders of the two groupings' member states. The Warsaw Pact and NATO could even now embark on closer cooperation and an exchange of military and political observers and experts, including opening each other's permanent missions at the two blocs' headquarters. We should probably even now be not only thinking of the future of these military-political structures but also taking specific steps to transform them into primarily political organizations. It is also possible to return to the idea of their joint disbandment, which, as is known, has long been advocated by the Warsaw Pact members.

All these problems fit perfectly well into the agenda of the new top-level all-European conference, the idea of convening which—advanced by M.S. Gorbachev—is gaining increasingly wide support. The dramatic changes in Europe, which sometimes outstrip the boldest forecasts, insistently dictate the need for the speediest holding of "Helsinki 2." Because it is precisely at such a forum that it will be possible to outline a way to carry out a coordinated reduction of armed forces and arms to the detriment of no one's security, while preserving stability and peace. This year could well be a crucial year for Europe of the real beating of swords into plowshares.

Vorontsov Briefing on Near East Issues Reported

PM2603112990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 4

[G. Charodeyev report: Near East: USSR's Active Policy. From Our Correspondent at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center"]

[Text] Yu. Vorontsov, USSR first deputy foreign minister, addressed representatives of the Near East mass media accredited in Moscow and Soviet journalists. He drew attention to the fact that USSR President M.S. Gorbachev singled out the Near East in his speech following his election to this post as a region where the Soviet Union intends to pursue an active policy.

"We are proceeding in our work," the Soviet diplomat stressed, "on the basis of the need to achieve most speedily an all-embracing settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict based on a balance of its participants' interests and the convening for this purpose under UN auspices of an international conference involving all parties directly involved, including the PLO, along with the permanent members of the UN Security Council."

A journalist from the United Arab Emirates asked the following question: Demands are being voiced in a number of countries in the region for a reduction in the emigration of Soviet Jews to Israel. What do you think of that?

"Under the new legislation," Yu. Vorontsov stressed, "which will evidently be adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet soon, all restrictions on Soviet citizens' travel abroad will be lifted. This applies to representatives of all nationalities. The new legislation conforms with international norms. A person wishing to leave the country obtains a foreign passport and goes to the recipient country for permanent or temporary residence. Incidentally these norms are also generally accepted within the Arab countries.

Question from KUNA (Kuwait): There is still a government crisis in Israel. There is the opinion that if S. Peres succeeds in forming a government, Soviet-Israeli diplomatic relations will be restored. Is that the case?

[Vorontsov] We link the problem of normalizing bilateral relations above all with progress in a Near East settlement. Depending on the success in this area, the Soviet Union will also resolve the problem of restoring diplomatic relations with Israel. We do not link the restoration of bilateral diplomatic relations with the appearance of a particular politician at the head of the Israeli Government. Israel's position on a Near East settlement is important for us at this moment.

A SANA (Syria) correspondent asked the following question: Is it true that direct Aeroflot flights are planned from Moscow to Tel Aviv?

"The Soviet airline will not make passenger flights of this kind in the near future. We have no interstate relations with Israel. Admittedly, it becomes necessary from time to time to make individual flights to deliver groups of performers and sportsmen. In those cases Aeroflot 'gives the go-ahead' for such flights. But I do not foresee regular passenger flights between Israel and the Soviet Union," the USSR first deputy foreign minister stressed.

'First Signs' of Thaw in Asia Welcomed

PM2603153390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 25 Mar 90 First Edition p 3

[Article by commentator Aleksandr Golts under the rubric "The World Today: Problems and Opinions": "Will the Ice Break?"]

[Text] The tumultuous process of changes which has swept Europe is very much like the spring ice drift. It is breaking up the preconceived thinking of military confrontation and shaking strategic conceptions which just recently seemed immutable. As you would expect, of course, this spring flood brings with it much debris and mud. Sometimes it seems that the powerful forces of the elements are out of control and are capable of sweeping away not only the ice of confrontation but also highly useful structures, too. For all the problems that this spring flood brings, it is obvious that it presages days of warmth and peace.

But that is in Europe. Asia, it seems, is still a long way from such a spring thaw. More than once when analyzing the military-political situation in the Asia-Pacific region in the past two to three years I couldn't help noticing that the process of reducing tension is moving far slower there. Even though, in an attempt to set the ball rolling, the Soviet Union has done no less there than in Europe. Our Armed Forces grouping in the east of the country is being considerably reduced. The date for the complete withdrawal of Soviet troops from Mongolia has already been set, and the military presence on Vietnamese territory is being cut drastically. Soviet-Chinese talks on the radical reduction of armed forces in the common border region are proceeding intensively.

However, many of our other initiatives aimed at lowering the level of military opposition in the region, addressed primarily to the United States and Japan, met until recently with a cold, not to say icy lack of comprehension in Tokyo and Washington. But now this winter of confrontation seems to be coming to an end. News of this arrived from the two capitals simultaneously.

For example, hearings on the situation in Asia have begun in one of the U.S. House of Representatives committees. Their progress has been quite unusual. During them, influential Congressman S. Solarz stated that the time has come to take arms control measures in the region. At the same time he stressed that it is the Soviet Union and not the United States which is making efforts to reach an accord on this issue. "Whereas President Gorbachev has put forward a series of concrete proposals on normalizing the situation in Asia," Solarz noted, "the United States continues to remain silent and makes no response to them. The U.S. position can only be regretted." In addition, the congressman spoke in favor of talks on naval arms, too.

The fact that an influential U.S. politician has begun speaking out in this manner may be seen as a sign of positive changes. That is all the more important because the present hearings are just the beginning of far broader congressional discussions on security problems in the Asia-Pacific region. The U.S. legislators have instructed the Pentagon to prepare a report by the beginning of April on the military-political situation in Asia and the Pacific. And they made it known quite categorically that they are highly interested in the possibility of cutting military spending in that region. Seeking to forestall the congressmen, Defense Secretary Cheney even hurried to announce the Pentagon's intention to reduce the size of its grouping there by 10 percent.

The Japanese leadership until quite recently took an even tougher line than the U.S. leadership with regard to talks on strengthening security. In Tokyo, too, however, there are signs that some new approaches are appearing. That is demonstrated in particular by a recent statement by Prime Minister Kaifu. Addressing parliament, he noted that he was prepared to welcome the holding of an international conference on security problems in Asia and the Pacific. He believes that one of the first steps here could be a meeting aimed at normalizing the situation on the Korean peninsula.

Such calls could inspire definite hopes. However, I used a question mark in the headline quite deliberately. Because in those same reports you can easily detect evidence that the old thinking has no intention of quitting the Asian scene.

At the U.S. Congressional hearings, for instance, R. Lehman, director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, asserted that the U.S. military presence in Asia helps to maintain stability and therefore Washington has no need for talks to limit naval forces and naval activity. And after making his proposal, the Japanese premier hastened to add the condition that the situation in Asia remains "tense." And that, therefore, both the United States and Japan must continue their defense efforts.

It is those "efforts" which are the problem. T. Kaifu recently addressed graduates of the National Defense Agency academy. There too he advocated increasing those "efforts." Why? Because of "Soviet military might, which continues to grow." Just how the USSR is "increasing its might" while also most drastically cutting its grouping in Asia remains an enigma which Kaifu has no intention of unraveling.

But as for Japan itself, there is no enigma there: Its defense spending is rising by an average of 6 percent a year. According to the KYODO news agency, it how has the world's third-largest defense spending increase. The results of such rapid growth speak for themselves. The navy, for example, now has hundreds of P-3C Orion aircraft, 60 frigates and destroyers, and now some ultramodern cruisers equipped with the Aegis system. The Japanese navy, according to the French magazine LE POINT, is gradually becoming an ocean-going fleet again. And it isn't just a question of the navy, either. The air force, with over 320 warplanes, will soon be receiving a new fighter. And the ground forces, armed with 1,200 tanks and 400 helicopters as well as missiles, has long been a powerful army certainly not designed for defense.

This buildup of military might has given pause even to Washington, which until quite recently did its utmost to encourage Japan's pretensions to the role of military power. The United States is beginning to adjust its approach. "The best way in which Japan can contribute to strengthening security," Cheney stated recently, "is to increase its support for the U.S. forces stationed there. First and foremost its material support. Not with small change but a 'full 100 percent' of the cost of the U.S. troop presence there immediately."

Tokyo was not at all vexed. Meanwhile, the upkeep of the 50,000-strong U.S. corps currently stands at $6 billion. Until recently Japan shouldered $2.4 billion of that, and this year Tokyo is ready to increase that sum by 9 percent. It has been stated that Japan is prepared to accept further spending.

Yet the Pentagon by no means intends to cut back its activeness in Asia. Thus, a major airborne assault landing 14 March kicked off the annual "Team Spirit" U.S.-South Korean maneuvers. Once again—as has been the case in previous years—U.S. and South Korean forces are rehearsing "major war" scenarios in Asia under the guise of "repulsing aggression from the North." Over 200 warplanes and a naval group including the nuclear aircraft carrier "Carl Vinson" were involved in the maneuvers.

The start of the "Team Spirit" maneuvers triggered a sharp but justified reaction in Pyongyang. It is hard to seek a way to solve the Korean problem by peaceful political means—something for which both Washington and Seoul claim to be ready—while large-scale military operations are being rehearsed on the peninsula. After all, artillery training during the maneuvers cannot be the prelude to the kind of conference being proposed by the Japanese prime minister.

Hardly will the "Team Spirit '90" maneuvers have finished than the Pentagon will start more large-scale military rehearsals in the region. The multinational "Rimpac" maneuvers will be held in the vast Pacific Ocean area from California to Hawaii 2 April through 21 May. More than 50 warships, including a carrier group from the U.S. Third Fleet, around 250 aircraft, and 50,000 servicemen from the United States, Japan, South Korea, Canada, and Australia will be taking part in them. Besides rehearsing maritime warfare, they will also be practicing an amphibious landing operation.

This is the first time that South Korea has taken part in this exercise. Previously it declined to take part in the "Rimpac" exercises, because this was evidence of a further strengthening of military ties between Washington, Tokyo, and Seoul. It can be seen that, despite the easing of the situation, some people have not abandoned their plans to create new military blocs.

Negative factors in the policies of a number of countries continue to hinder progress toward detente in Asia. Nevertheless, it seems to me, there are the first signs that the ice of confrontation will be broken there, too. I recall that in M.S. Gorbachev's first speech as president of the USSR he stressed that the processes of building peace-loving communities in Europe and Asia must ultimately culminate in the creation of a single security system in the entire Eurasian space. And for that it needs a perceptible warming of the climate not only in Europe but also in the Pacific.

United States & Canada

Gorbachev, Kennedy Discuss Relations, Lithuania

PM2703072990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian Second Edition 27 Mar 90 p 1

[TASS report: "Senator E. Kennedy Visits USSR President"]

[Text] Welcoming his old friend, Gorbachev noted the role of the Kennedy family in U.S. political life and in international politics.

He said precursors of the current relations between the Soviet Union and the United States appeared for the first time after the Second World War when President John Kennedy was in office. He spoke highly of Edward Kennedy's personal contribution to the constructive development of these relations.

In the context of the improvement of Soviet-American relations, Gorbachev and Kennedy discussed general problems of the current stage in the world development.

It was pointed out that the careful attitude to achievements in Soviet-U.S. interaction in the past few years made one more and more confident that the two countries can maintain fruitful cooperation for a long time and overcome negative consequences and habits of the previous phase.

Gorbachev said the profound changes in the world are taking place with difficulty and, in some areas, painfully. There emerge unexpected turns of events, conflicts and crises.

When the world was just entering this crucial stage, it was often pointed out in contacts with Western leaders that in this difficult and rapid process one should avoid the temptation to use it to anyone's detriment, and there seemed to be understanding on that score.

However, when difficulties appeared, people start to forget about this and even to use their usual double standards, measuring their own actions, even in other countries, by one yardstick and actions by others in their own country—by another. They start to express concern, to warn, instruct and so on.

Kennedy also expressed concern about the developments in Lithuania.

Responding to this, Gorbachev said: "I think we have offered quite a few convincing proofs of our adherence to new thinking, to the policy of renouncing cold war methods and the reliance on force, proofs of our respect for people's right to choose and to equal security."

The very process of far-reaching changes in our society most strongly proves that we have irrevocably embarked on the road of democracy, law and order, on the road of radical changes in politics, in the economy and the very mode of life.

Speaking about problems connected with Lithuania, Gorbachev said the Soviet leadership was given the mandate by the Third Congress of People's Deputies—the supreme legislative body of the country.

The intention to act in accordance with such a mandate should be respected by those who defend their constitution and legality so decisively and using all means.

Seeking a just solution to the problem, we will act so that the Constitution should not be violated, that the interests of all republics should be taken into account and the security of each Soviet citizen ensured.

The drafting of a Union Treaty, the fundamental reorganisation of the federal setup of our state and the bill on the withdrawal from the USSR, being discussed now, promote this goal.

The presidential power will also be used to defend democracy and glasnost, to ensure the rule of law and the constitutional order, to prevent the weakening of the state and to stop actions by extremist forces that can provoke much trouble.

In conclusion, Gorbachev and Kennedy discussed the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, scheduled for this summer.

Gorbachev asked Kennedy to convey his best wishes to President George Bush.

Further Reportage on U.S. Admiral Crowe's Visit

Crowe Addresses Moscow Press

PM2203142390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 22 Mar 90 First Edition p 3

[Colonel V. Markushin report: "W. Crowe: Military Balance Should Be Dynamic"]

[Text] A meeting between members of the Supreme Soviet Committees on Defense and State Security Questions and on International Affairs was held in the Kremlin 21 March with U.S. Admiral W. Crowe, who is visiting our country.

Addressing the people's deputies and press representatives, W. Crowe set out some of his ideas on questions of U.S. military policy and international problems. Touching on current U.S. strategy, he stressed the importance of retaining its main elements: nuclear deterrence, forward basing, the existence of powerful reserves for transfer to any region, and so forth. In the admiral's opinion, the essence of U.S. military policy is to safeguard the security of the United States and its allies. All this, he said, is based on a well-oiled process of military building and cannot be rejected merely because abrupt changes are occurring in the Soviet Union.

Touching on the question of the prospects for NATO's existence, W. Crowe said that the alliance is a sophisticated mechanism for maintaining peace and that a different mechanism is unlikely to emerge in the foreseeable future. At the same time, the admiral advocated a constructive dialogue on disarmament. He also noted that the Soviet Union's troop cuts and withdrawals from Europe cannot go unnoticed and that the military balance should be dynamic.

Touching on naval armaments, W. Crowe repeated the well-known U.S. position that the Navy exists solely to defend vitally important sea lanes for that country.

W. Crowe also talked about the mechanism whereby the U.S. Congress participates in determining military policy, stressing the important element of openness. He said that this is hard to achieve, but the returns are great.

After his speech W. Crowe answered questions from those present. There were many questions. They mainly concerned the most important key aspects of international policy. Before answering one question, the admiral joked that in such cases people in America say: "It's more than my job's worth."

Akhromeyev-Crowe Press Conference

PM2703074390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 24 Mar 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "At the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center"]

[Text] A press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists was held at the USSR Foreign Ministry press center in Moscow 23 March by Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Defense and State Security Questions, and Admiral W. Crowe, former chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, who was in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Defense and State Security Questions.

Speaking at the press conference, Adm. W. Crowe shared his impressions of his tour of the Soviet Union. I visited Kiev, Odessa, and Novosibirsk, he said, I visited military units and enterprises—and everywhere the conversations took place in an atmosphere of sincerity and trust.

Saying that he was speaking as an individual, W. Crowe set out his view on certain components of modern U.S. military policy, noting the West's growing trust toward the Soviet Union. In the admiral's opinion, the changes taking place in the Soviet Union are helping the positive development of the world situation.

Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev talked about the perestroyka taking place in the country and the USSR Armed Forces, the problems caused by the cutback in the Soviet Armed Forces, and about increased construction of housing for military families.

Adm. W. Crowe and Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev answered journalists' questions.

Crowe Queried on Military Ties

PM2603100790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Interview with retired Admiral William Crowe, senior staffer at Washington's Center for Strategic and International Studies, by B. Ivanov: "W. Crowe: I Have Been Criticized on Many Occasions"; date and place of interview not specified; first four paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] IZVESTIYA's editorial office was visited by a man whose photograph has appeared on several occasions on the front pages of U.S. newspapers and journals over the last few years. Our interlocutor was retired Admiral William Crowe, who was paying a private visit to Moscow.

He was 65 years of age in January. By American standards, he has had a brilliant military career: He began as a military school cadet, rose to the rank of full admiral, and for the last few years, moreover, held the highest military post in the United States—chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He held this post for two terms in succession. According to U.S. observers, his period in office was a landmark in U.S. Armed Forces history: It was the first time that the post had been held by a man who had not fought in World War II and who, in the view of many people, expressed the views and philosophy not of the old campaigners but of the intellectual section of the U.S. Armed Forces officer corps. He openly defended the viewpoint that the armed forces should not develop "by themselves" and should not be isolated from external processes and should "follow the country's political course and adapt to changing conditions in the development of civilian society." During his last years in the service he was the U.S. President's chief military adviser.

W. Crowe is now a senior official at Washington's Center for Strategic and International Studies. He is also a university professor in Oklahoma, where he is giving a course of lectures on certain aspects of political science.

It transpired that our conversation took place on the day that Central Television showed a report on the visit to one of our troop units by a group of U.S. cadets from West Point Military Academy. Their trip to the Soviet Union was made possible by the bilateral agreement on USSR-U.S. exchanges in the military sphere, in which W. Crowe played a major role. So the first question asked itself.

[Ivanov] What specific forms of military cooperation are possible, in your view, between Moscow and Washington in the future?

[Crowe] When I and Marshal Akhromeyev elaborated the program for military exchanges, we planned it over a two-year period. In particular, it makes provision for reciprocal visits by warships, exchanges of armed forces leadership representatives and military training establishment students, and other measures. We also thought that the term of the program in question should be extended and that its framework could be broadened in time, for example by setting up special courses for joint training of servicemen. As for the future, I would like to see similar reciprocal visits between cadets from naval and air force academies... Nor do I rule out the possibility of conducting joint military exercises involving small Soviet and American troop subunits. I can quite easily imagine that situation today...

[Ivanov] For a number of years the problem of monitoring represented the main obstacle to the conclusion of a treaty on the universal and complete banning of nuclear weapons testing. Last year's joint experiments conducted by Soviet and American specialists seemed to close the gap between the sides' positions on this question; however, the future of a treaty is still vague and uncertain. What are your views on this subject?

[Crowe] I do not consider all the results of these experiments to be reassuring. So we must continue this work in the future. The U.S. side's position on this score consists in not forcing the pace of events but making gradual progress, "step by step." As for a treaty on the universal and complete banning of nuclear tests, my view on this question—a military man's viewpoint—is simple. I believe that, as long as there is a need for nuclear weapons, we must have an opportunity to test them and keep them in readiness. I consider it a great mistake to stop tests while our arsenals still contain nuclear arms.

[Ivanov] In other words, you are opposed to concluding any agreement now on the complete banning of nuclear tests?

[Crowe] In the current situation, yes. Moreover, we have still not done everything that we could to cut back strategic arms.

[Ivanov] When, in your opinion, could a treaty be concluded in this sphere?

[Crowe] I believe that such a treaty could be ready this year. At least, all the fundamental questions could be coordinated within this period.

[Ivanov] Of late articles have frequently appeared in the Soviet press criticizing our country's armed forces. This has frequently resulted in trenchant polemics between representatives of the army leadership and the mass media. What is the U.S. situation in this regard? Do American journalists criticize their army?

[Crowe] Of course they do.

[Ivanov] How does the Pentagon leadership react to this—as pathologically as they do in our country?

[Crowe] The armed forces are part of American society, part of American culture. That is why the military's attitude to criticism is the same as that of any civilian. I assure you that all Americans support freedom of the press. Many of the questions that arise in your country simply could not arise in our country. The following is clearly stipulated in the mind of every American: The press must be free. Only then will it play a constructive role. Including a role with regard to the armed forces. I myself have been sharply criticized on many occasions in the press. I will not hide the fact that this was not always pleasant, but it never occurred to me to question the press' right to criticize me personally or anyone else.

U.S. Demonsatration in Support of Hostages Noted

PM2603134790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Mar 90 Second Edition p 6

[Own correspondent V. Gan dispatch under the rubric "20th-Century Ills": "Hostages: Grief and Hope"]

[Text] Washington—It may all strike some people as an exaggeration, but on that spring day Lafayette Square opposite the White House was grieving. Along with everyone—those keeping a constant antiwar vigil, tourists, and chance passersby.

In the middle of the crowd at the center of the square stood a black-framed white shield with yellow narcissi woven into it. Names picked out in black on white leaped out at you—William Buckley (American, died 1985), Dennis Hill (Briton, died 1985), Arkadiy Katkov (Russian, died 1985), Nikolas Klatters [name as transliterated] (Netherlander, died 1985), Mayks Surat [name as transliterated] (Frenchman, died 1986)...

It was simultaneously both a list of names of the dead and a prayer that knew no geographic, political, ideological, or other bounds. Those who gathered in Lafayette Square were grieving simply for people—the dead and those who are, they hope, still alive. For people from different corners of the planet who suddenly found themselves bound by the same merciless hand—terrorism.

AP correspondent Terry Anderson was abducted in Beirut exactly five years ago. It was this anniversary that his colleagues and friends and everyone refusing to be reconciled to the concept and word "hostage" had come to mark in the square sprinkled with spring colors. Among the 18 foreign citizens who have been seized by terrorists in Beirut in various years and who are still alive Anderson has been held longer than anyone in unknown torture chambers. The white shield bore the names only of those who have been killed out of fanatical blindness by people who cannot conceive of their political struggle without blackmail and killings. Including our Arkadiy Katkov...

It was probably no coincidence that Lafayette Square was chosen as the venue for the gathering. Linking arms, people looked toward the White House, awaiting active diplomatic assistance from it.

...Many signals have appeared recently with regard to possible success in the matter of freeing the hostages. In the heat of the activity a few weeks ago there was even an embarrassing occasion when President Bush spoke by telephone with someone calling himself the president of Iran, but who turned out in the end to be an impostor. A few days ago a statement which former U.S. President J. Carter made at a news conference in Damascus was reported. He declared after a series of talks in the Near East: "It is my own conviction that there is now a greater chance of their release than before."

Not quite substantiated optimism, perhaps. Although Washington pins the whole weight of responsibility on Tehran, in fact the people there who advocate the hostages' immediate release do not control the perpetrators of crimes in Beirut. According to informed sources, those who are in charge of the terrorists are intransigent and insist on the death penalty for some and on "indefinite captivity" for others.

So, time is inexorable, and one more sad milestone has been erected in the tragic saga of the criminal theory and practice of political hostage-taking. Over the past five years the daughter of my colleague Terry Anderson has been growing up without ever having seen her father. A recording of a message from her was shown recently on Beirut television. "I love you, Daddy. Come home," she said, seated before the camera. There was no answer...

Northeast Asia

Soviets Remind North Korea of Past Sacrifices

SK2303080190 Moscow International Service in Korean 0900 GMT 20 Mar 90

[Text] This year is a meaningful year for the Korean people. It is the 45th anniversary of the Korean liberation from Japanese militarism. The Soviet Union played an (?important) role in achieving this liberation.

On this theme, we will now carry an interview with (Georgiy Plotnikov), chairman of the Korean Group of the Soviet Veterans Committee and an associate doctor of history.

In this interview, Associate Doctor (Georgiy Plotnikov) began with the less-publicized facts, things not put in publications in the past. He said: [Recording in Russian fading into Korean translation read by announcer] In the early 1940's, Korean partisan units and Chinese partisans who were engaged in activities in the southern and southeastern areas of Manchuria retreated to the northern area of Manchuria, an area close to the border with the Soviet Union, because of the Japanese attack. They began to adopt small-unit tactics, and many units crossed over into Soviet territory.

In the course of this, (?most of the Korean partisans) gathered at the village of (Iatsko), south of Khabarovsk. There, they were provided with medical support and rested. [passage indistinct] (?Best-trained) partisans were sent to a guerrilla school in Khabarovsk.

After this, a special combined unit called the 88th Snipers Brigade was formed at the school in June 1942. It was composed of Chinese partisans, Korean partisans, and minority races residing in the areas along the Amur River. Lieutenant Colonel (Chu Po-chin), who used to be the commander of [word indistinct], took command of the brigade.

So, this was the beginning of Soviet military aid for the Korean people's struggle to free Korea from Japanese rule.

Soviet aid became more specific in August 1945. In connection with this, we asked Chairman (Georgiy Plotnikov) to tell us about the development of the situation at that time.

He said: [Recording in Russian fading into Korean translation read by announcer] According to the decision reached at the Yalta meeting in 1945, the Soviet Armed Forces began to carry out their mission as a liberator in the Far East in August 1945. The units of the 25th Combined Army, led by Colonel General (Ivan Zhidkov), were (?mobilized to defeat) the 3rd Japanese [word indistinct] Combined Army, which they were confronting in an area near the Korean border.

The severest battles were waged in the northeastern region of the Korean peninsula. On the Soviet side, the units of the 25th Combined Army, the 386th and 393d Snipers Divisions, the Marines, and the personnel of the Pacific Fleet and its aviation units participated in these battles.

Until 12 August 1945, the units of the 25th Combined Army and other units, in cooperation with the Marines, occupied the cities of Unggi and Najin. At the same time, active preparations were made to have the Marines occupy Chongjin, which was a Japanese naval base.

Here, we should note the fact that the Japanese had turned Chongjin into a solid fortress. The troops of the Chongjin Garrison Command numbered about 4,000. In particular, on (Homal) (?hill) which looks over Chongjin Bay from north, there was a solid stronghold. Thus, the Marines' combat was particularly severe. On the evening of 14 August, the Marines (?had to retreat to the piers of the harbor due to the severe resistance of the enemy). However, they accomplished their mission anyway.

On the evening of 16 August, with the help of the 393rd Snipers Division, the results of the combat came out in our favor. At the same time, Nanam City was liberated.

Then, by bringing Chongjin under Soviet Army control, the Japanese (?Kanto) Army's communication line with its homeland via North Korea was cut.

The then commander of the Far East Soviet Army [name indistinct] said that the (?occupying) the defense positions of the Japanese Army in(?North Korea) decisively influenced the surrender of the Japanese Army and the early conclusion of the war in the Far East.

The Soviet Army fulfilled its international duty and liberated Korea step by step. On 24 August, the paratroopers of the 384th Snipers Division landed at Pyongyang and Hamhung. [sentence indistinct]

In late August, the headquarters of the 25th Combined Army moved to Pyongyang from (?Yanji). The Korean people earned the freedom which they longed for day and night.

What were the Soviet Army losses?

On this, (Plotnikov) said: [Recording in Russian fading into Korean translation read by announcer] The Soviet people paid a precious price for the liberation of Korea. Only in the 25th Combined Army, 4,717 soldiers became victims. Among them, about 1,500 were killed in combat. At the same time, the Marine unit, the combined units, the aviation units, and cruisers in the Pacific Fleet also (?suffered great loss).

The Japanese fought desperate battles. Here, I would like to note that the Japanese treated the landing of the U.S. troops in a diametrically different manner than that of the Soviet Army. The Japanese (?thought that their deliverance from the Korean people's just animosity was possible) through the landing of U.S. soldiers.

On 14 October 1945, 100,000 people participated in a mass rally in Pyongyang.

Speaking at the rally, Comrade Kim Il-song said that, in August 1945, the Soviet Army defeated the Japanese Kanto Army and liberated Korea. We will eternally remember the (?kindness) of our liberator, the Soviet Union.

However, recently in Korea, the feat of the Soviet Army has begun to be forgotten. The remains of those Soviet soldiers killed in combat cry to our conscience that we underestimate their feat and that we have no right to forget their feat.

Twenty-six men and officers of the Soviet Army, Air Force, and Navy received the title of Hero for (?their feats performed in the war to liberate Korea).

The Soviet Union not only liberated North Korea, but also recovered the national treasure of the country and turned it over to the people's organ of power. At the same time, it offered unselfish aid for the rehabilitation of facilities (?destroyed) by the Japanese and for the construction of new enterprises.

Further on Interview

SK2403094990 Moscow International Service in Korean 0900 GMT 21 Mar 90

[Text] We will continue to carry the talk by (Georgiy Plotnikov), chairman of the Korean Group of the Soviet Veterans Committee and an associate doctor of history. This talk deals with the Soviet people's internationalist feats in the DPRK. The first installment of this talk program, which we carried yesterday, dealt with the period of Korea's liberation from Japanese militarism.

In today's installment, (Georgiy Plotnikov) will talk about the well-known Soviet people's contribution to defending the DPRK, and unheralded internationalist Soviet soldiers during Korea's 1950-1953 Fatherland Liberation War.

[Recording in Russian fading into Korean translation read by announcer] In September 1948, after the DPRK declared its birth only three years after the liberation of Korea, the Supreme People's Assembly, People's Korea's [as received] highest legislature, asked the Soviet and U.S. Governments to withdraw all of their forces and to promote an atmosphere for achieving the reunification of Korea and building a peace-loving, democratic Korean state. The Soviet Government responded (?affirmatively) to the North side's demand. The last train with Soviet troops aboard left the Korean capital on 26 December 1948, while receiving a warm farewell by Pyongyang citizens. At a mass rally in Pyongyang at that time, a letter of thanks written on silk was given to the representatives of the Soviet command. Almost 17 million Korean people signed this letter. This letter is a document [words indistinct]. A symbol of the Korean people's friendship toward the Soviet troops, this letter is still preserved in the Central Soviet Armed Forces Museum.

However, the U.S. military authorities stationed in South Korea responded differently to People's Korea's demand. General (Hortz), commander of the U.S. Forces in Korea, told reporters that the U.S. troops would not withdraw in the immediate future. However, as the situation developed, the U.S. troops could not help but withdraw from South Korea.

Under the circumstances in which the U.S. troops had been withdrawn, North and South Korea appeared to be able to sit face to face at talks and to find formulas of dialogue and keys for the reunification of the fatherland. However, a good atmosphere towards this end had not been promoted. As a result, a fratricidal war between the North and South started on 25 June 1950, and this war later developed into a U.S. aggression. The socialist countries did not leave the Korean people who had faced such a misfortune alone. The Soviet Union, China, and other countries gave a large amount of economic, military, and diplomatic assistance to the DPRK. The Chinese people sent approximately one million volunteers to the Korean front.

In August, U.S. airplanes began air raids on the territories of the DPRK and the PRC. As a result, the central Chinese Government asked the Soviet Government to send an anti-aircraft air corps and anti-aircraft batteries to China.

An air division of the Moscow Military District commanded by (Ivan Korchetov) was one of the first Soviet combined Air Force units to have been sent to China. This combined Air Force unit started [word indistinct] operations in October 1950. Military units from [words indistinct] joined this combined Air Force unit. This combined Air Force unit was combined with the 64th Anti-Aircraft Air Corps later. (Georgi Robov) began commanding this corps in November. (Robov) personally participated in combat operations. I learned from (Robov) and other pilots that (Robov) shot down 14 enemy fighters. However, some other data shows that (Yurgeni Peperiaev), another Soviet soldier, shot down the largest number of enemy fighters—that is, 20—including several B-29 medium-sized bombers. Soviet pilots covered not only the northeastern area of China but also, in reality, the entire Korean area, including the front line. Here, I must point out that, in order to conceal their identities, Soviet pilots were not allowed to fly in the sky over the sea or areas taken by the [ROK] Armed Forces and the U.S. forces except for emergency landings. However, this was a nonsensical policy. Americans knew very well who was fighting against them in the sky over Korea. (Georgi Robov) said that approximately 70,000 pilots, anti-aircraft artillery men, and technicians served at his corps. Twelve air divisions, in turn, served at this corps. Our MiG-15 and MiG-15 (bis)-type planes were no poorer than U.S. planes on tactical and technological terms, and the weapons that these planes were equipped with were superior to those of U.S. (?Thunder) jets and F-86 Sabers.

The U.S. forces command expected much from large-scale air raids. At times as many as 60 to 80 B-29's scrambled. [name indistinct] airplanes covered these bombers. The U.S. Forces tried on many occasions to bomb the Supung Hydraulic Power Station, which was strategically significant because it supplied electric power to Korea and some regions of China. However, the U.S. pilots' attempt ended in failure because of the courage of Soviet pilots.

In answering our question of how many enemy airplanes the Soviet pilots shot down and how may airplanes we lost, (Georgi Plokinkov) said:

[Recording in Russian fading into Korean translation read by announcer] A work by Mikhail Kapitsa entitled "Three Policies of 30 Years" points out that tens of [as heard] U.S. airplanes were shot down during the Korean War. When we talked with our pilots, I came to learn another figure. I think that our pilots shot down 1,200 to 1,300 enemy airplanes from October 1950 until the time when the Armistice Agreement was signed. No official data has been made public. Counting how many of our airplanes were lost is a more complicated matter. I have tried find out how many. However, regrettably, official documents on this war have been and will be kept secret for a long time. I do not know how many people were killed in action during the Korean War. Moreover, I could only find those who rendered distinguished services during the war based upon secondary clues. We must not forget that there was no concept called openness at that time. I can only point out that more than 20 pilots were given the title of Soviet Hero for their distinguished services in the Korean War.

To conclude, in answering the question of why our military aid, for example the dispatch of our Air Corps, was necessary and how People's Korea's Air Force was at that time, (Plokinkov) said:

[Recording in Russian fading into Korean translation read by announcer] At around the start of the war, People's Korea had its own Air Corps. However, it was armed with such propeller-powered airplanes as [names indistinct]. These airplanes which the Soviet Armed Forces were armed with during the Great Fatherland War demonstrated their high combat capabilities. However, the Americans sent (?Thunder) jets, F-86 Sabers, and other jet-propelled airplanes to the Korean front. The tactical and technological performance of these planes were incomparably superior to those of [name indistinct] airplanes. The strength of the U.S. Air Force, which was sent to the Korean front, was incomparably strong. The U.S. sent two Air Force units to the Korean front. Since Soviet pilots aboard MiG-15's and MiG-15 (bis)-type planes had appeared in the northeastern area of China, the situation fundamentally changed. While being involved in a combat action to defeat the air raids of the U.S. Air Force units, our pilots also trained Korean pilots to fly jet-propelled airplanes. Korean and Chinese pilots who were enlisted into a joint Air Force unit successfully learned how to pilot the new airplanes. In 1952, they began to pilot jet-propelled airplanes alone. They had flown together with our pilots before. In addition to the assistance of an air corps, the Soviet Union was planning to send five armored divisions to Korea if the situation there worsened. Soviet military advisers and technicians were in People's Korea, and, as I have already said, we supplied all the necessary material. If not for our assistance, the Korean People's Army and the Chinese People's Volunteers would not have been able to engage in combat. I see the Soviet people's internationalist feats here. Even though not many years had passed since the Great Fatherland War was over, and even though our country was in a difficult situation, the Soviet people supplied unselfish assistance to the Korean people.

Dear listeners: This has been the 2d installment of the talk by (Georgiy Plotinkov), chairman of the Korean Group of the Soviet Veterans Committee and an associate doctor of history . This installment dealt with how the Soviet people contributed to defending People's Korea from the U.S. imperialists' aggression.

Roots of DPRK Revolutionary Fervor Viewed

PM2303145690 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 21 Mar 90 p 3

[Second, concluding part of article by own correspondent A. Platkovskiy in Pyongyang: "Tower of Rice and Steel"]

[Text]

Temperature of Society Rising to Revolutionary Fever Pitch

The New Year, 1990, was celebrated with dignity in Pyongyang, with traditions observed. High-ranking cadre personnel sat in comfortable seats in the stalls and amphitheater. Members of the presidential guard took up their positions outside the auditorium, in the halls, smoking rooms, and corridors. On stage, behind the lowered curtain, children lined up ready for greeting were wearing themselves out with excitement.

At last, the doors were flung open and the leader [vozhd], at the head of [vo glave s] his retinue, appeared in the auditorium. At the same moment, the walls shook to the powerful sound expelled by hundreds of pairs of lungs at once. "Manse!" The victory cry was repeatedly roared, sending a tremor through the auditorium. Everyone shouted: members of the Politburo and the government, generals, and leaders of central departments and institutions.

On the first morning of the New Year, the people of Pyongyang, young and old, gravitated in an endless stream toward the statue of Kim Il-song, looming over the city on Munsu Hill. Such is the custom: to express your gratitude and loyalty on festive days. People had already listened to the leader's New Year radio address to the nation. In his address, he said that an important, crucial period had begun in the country's history. The fate of the "sacred cause" was being decided: building a socialist paradise and achieving the nation's dream of unifying the motherland. Consequently, the people must further strengthen "the spirit of relying on their own strengths and stubbornly struggling against difficulties." The leader also said this: If we manufacture more good-quality consumer goods and fill our stores with them, our people will have nothing to envy in life.

A plenum of the Worker's Party of Korea (WPK) Central Committee was held on 5 January, at which the situation in the economy was discussed. The session lasted five days. To all appearances, the situation demanded it. The current Seven-Year Plan, the third so far, has entered a decisive phase and begun its fourth year. The grandiose plans demand that unprecedented growth rates be sustained: an average of 14 percent per annum. However, the country's economy has been running at maximum power, in a tough, mobilization regimen, for years—decades, even.

It is a complex, risky business to analyze the state of the DPRK economy. The official statistics only depict the economy in terms of relative figures: as percentages of what has already been achieved. A leading specialist at the National Economy Institute explained to me that absolute indicators of development are classified, "because they could be exploited by enemies."

I will not venture to make a diagnosis now. I will simply try to answer this question: How does the country manage to sustain such high dynamics of development? What mechanism governs the "economic miracle" in the DPRK?

The recent plenum, according to the communique, has the same significance as the plenum held in December 1956. What could this mean? Let us take a look at the past, following official historiography.

That was a time filled with dramatic struggle: the fate of the Korean revolution was being decided. The Syngman Rhee clique was preparing for "a new offensive against the north." The imperialists were furiously opposed to socialism. Revisionists were rearing their heads in the international communist movement, encroaching on fundamental values. Counterrevolutionary forces were becoming more active inside the country. The Korean people were finding it very hard to rebuild their national economy, devastated by the three-year war (1950-1953). There were food shortages and people were living in dugouts. Factional elements "infected with obsequiousness" exploited the difficulties to their own ends. They were opposed to the line taken by the party and the leader, disputing the need to "place excessive emphasis on the building of heavy industry at a time when people are finding it hard to live" and insisting on more resources to meet consumer needs. In rural areas, landowning peasants and their stooges were desperately resisting the policy of forming cooperatives on a massive scale.

The leader was waging a decisive struggle against antiparty elements, "strengthening the function of the dictatorship of the proletariat." It was a bitter battle.

In the summer of 1956, when Kim Il-song was on a visit to socialist countries, members of a faction began organizing a counterrevolutionary plot to overthrow the party leadership. With the help of their accomplices, they prepared an armed uprising.

At the August plenum of the party Central Committee, the faction went onto the attack. But the plenum participants, headed by the leader, dealt the faction a decisive blow. The conspiratorial group was crushed. The ringleaders, Choe Chang-ik and Pak Chang-ok, were branded as "revisionists working under the aegis of outside forces." They had opposed the line taken by the leader, denied the leading role of the party and the dictatorship of the proletariat, opposed the principle of democratic centralism, called for "freedom" of political activity, and advanced "the theory of the usefulness of factions." They had also intended to proclaim the DPRK a "neutral state" of pro-American persuasions.

After the plenum a massive campaign began, sweeping the whole of society, during which a merciless struggle was waged against "filth." The most inveterate were publicly shot in stadiums or on hillsides, having been first blindfolded. Those who had succumbed to the faction's ideas were reeducated, the most diverse forms and methods being used for this purpose.

It was in this general climate that the Central Committee plenum which "initiated the great revolutionary upsurge" was held, at the beginning of December 1956. At the plenum, the leader advanced this slogan: "Let us fulfill the Five-Year Plan ahead of schedule by increasing output and economizing!"

Kim Il-song said at the plenum that, although the party had dealt a blow to the counterrevolutionary faction, it had not ceased its petty intrigues despite this.

Kim Il-song's speech at the plenum is now described as historic. It set out "an active course with the leader's far-reaching idea." This consisted in "turning an unfavorable situation into a favorable situation, and misfortune into happiness." In other words, this meant "striving for monolithic unity and cohesion, intensifying the struggle against counterrevolutionary forces, and, on this basis, mobilizing the revolutionary enthusiasm of the masses."

Certain "passive elements" at the plenum insisted on easing the pace of economic development. But the leader rejected their attempts and set a truly unprecedented task: to achieve a 21-percent increase in industrial output in the next year, 1957!

Evidently it was then that the leader's idea—which has today acquired the all-conquering might of a general line—was first conceived. It was the idea of a mobilizing leap under the slogan "Let us forge ahead at the speed of Chollima." According to ancient legend, the winged horse Chollima makes gigantic leaps, covering 1,000 li (approximately 400 km) in a day.

On 28 December 1956, despite a raging snowstorm, the great leader visited the Kangson steelworks. He gathered the workers together and, keeping nothing from them, told them about the situation that had developed. "We are now in a very difficult situation.... People from one country are imposing their factionaries on us, while people from another country are putting pressure on us in tandem with the former. Factional elements in our country, each protected by their own master, are working against the party. Syngman Rhee intends to attack us, relying on the United States for support."

The workers' hearts filled with rage toward those who were against the leader and the revolution. Who could dare to torment our beloved leader!

Kim Il-song looked round the workers and continued:

"Whom can we rely on? Apart from you, there is no one to rely on...."

Following these words, the workers leapt from their seats and cried: "Long live Comrade Kim Il-song!"

With raised fists, they expressed their readiness to do any bidding and asked him to send the factionaries to them so that they could throw them into the electric furnace. "The strength, ready to move mountains, and the ardent enthusiasm of the Korean working class, comparable to molten metal, were an inestimable wealth in the task of construction and, for our enemies, this strength was like a gleaming sword of merciless retribution." The leader inspired this combat detachment, determined to make it "an example of working new miracles."

That is the account, in the second volume of the popular DPRK anthology "Bountiful Sun," of this episode in the life of Kim Il-song, by which he initiated the nationwide Chollima movement.

The whole country was inspired to make the great march forward at the speed of Chollima. Steel was smelted, chimneys smoked, buildings grew, mines penetrated ever deeper underground....

We can certainly ask what is meant by such euphemisms as "great-power chauvinists" and "people from one country," used by DPRK historians in their account of events at that time. It is difficult to raise these strata when our own historians are silent. But this will have to be done sooner or later. In speeches made by Kim Il-song at that time I have come across references to the fact that the factional groups were divided into "pro-Soviet" and "pro-Chinese"....

It was a complex period in history. Remember 1956: the 20th Congress, the exposure of the personality cult, the suppression of the rebellion in Hungary, the first attempts to embark on the "great leap forward" in China, and the struggle that developed around that.

When explaining how socialism's economic laws work, Kim Il-song often refers to military practice. For example, he compares production forces with armed forces: In the first instance the object of battle is nature and, in the second, the enemy. The leader had this to say in 1959: "In order to storm the next height in wartime, it is necessary to replenish the armed forces and supply them with ammunition and provisions, and, only after adequate preparation, launch a new attack." This meant that in economic building the bugler sounded the "retreat." The period of "regulation" began. It was necessary to eliminate "a certain disproportion that had arisen during the rapid move forward in the struggle to fulfill the first five-year plan ahead of schedule and to regulate proportions in the development of national economic sectors." Metallurgy, power engineering, coal mining, and transport were classed as "weak links." In addition to this, agriculture had lost a large proportion of its workforce. People were being mobilized into construction and production armies. Approximately one-sixth of arable land was left unworked as a result of this. A tense situation was taking shape with regard to food and housing in the cities.

But the "miracle" happened nevertheless. The "great upsurge" really did take place, and the pace at which it moved was simply bewitching. The question of how to maintain this momentum was pondered by the country's leadership. The logic they used was that the Chollima movement was not a series of leaps but a long jump into the future, in the course of which every sphere of social life would be transformed and man's consciousness modified. A universal method of revolutionary building was in fact found. In addition to the unique pace of development, it also made it possible to solve the problems of achieving a monolithic society that was ideologically pure. Deliverance from alien viruses is also a permanent process. Until imperialism is destroyed and revolution conquers on a world scale, society will be threatened by servility, dogmatism, revisionism, passivity, individualism, consumerism, nepotism, parochialism, and so on and so forth.

Special attention must be devoted to the party: After all, even "metal left out in the air grows rusty and unfit for use if it is not looked after properly." It was no accident that in 1986 the leader had to remind people again of attacks by counterrevolutionary elements.

From January to the present day, the country has been swept by rallies, demonstrations, meetings, and conferences in support of the leader's New Year speech and the January plenum decisions. Speakers are calling for a new general offensive in the spirit of Chollima. The newspapers are writing about setting a new pace: "the pace of the nineties."

In North Hamgyong Province, the production of coal has increased by 60 percent in comparison to last year, steel—by 17 percent, and cast iron—by 26 percent.

The builders of a vinalon association in Sunchon are working twice as fast as they did last year.

Tokchon's miners have doubled the speed at which coal is drilled for and extracted.

Metallurgists have smelted 16 percent more steel than in the corresponding period last year.

The mechanism of "total sublimation" has been engaged. Society's temperature is rising to revolutionary fever pitch. The limits of the impossible are crumbling under the impact of the "all-conquering impulse." On the battlefields where armies and their military leaders are in action, a battle is being fought for new heights. Increasingly fantastic heights.

Speculation About Contents of Gorbachev Reply

SK2703125090 Seoul YONHAP in English 1243 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, March 27 (YONHAP)—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev's reply to South Korean President No Tae-u's personal letter was delivered Tuesday to an entourage of Kim Yong-sam, co-leader of the ruling Democratic Liberal Party (DLP), who just wound up his week-long visit here.

Pak Chol-on, first state minister for Political Affairs, received the reply from the Soviet side during the third round of working-level meeting held for discussing diplomatic ties between the two nations.

It was not known immediately whether Gorbachev's letter contains the direction and timing of opening the Seoul-Moscow diplomatic ties.

Pak told reporters: "Part of the contents in the reply will be made public later in Seoul after I make a report to President No on the matter."

Asked on the reply, Kim said "I'd better withhold comment on that particular matter at this time."

No's personal letter hoping for an early formal diplomatic ties was handed to the Soviet leader on Thursday.

Kim and his 11-member official entourage headed for Tokyo Tuesday on their way home after their eight-day visit to the Soviet Union.

"I am very satisfied with the results of my visit to Moscow," Kim told reporters during a brief planeside interview, expressing optimism that ties between the two nations will be normalized.

On hand at the Shermetyevo [spelling as received] International Airport to bid farewell to Kim and his entourage were Vladlen Martynov, director of the Institute for World Economy and International Relations (IMEMO), Alexander Kislov, deputy director of IMEMO, Kong No-myong, head of the Korean Consular Department in Moscow.

Kim's Moscow trip was made at the inviation of IMEMO. Kim made his first visit to the Soviet Union last June at the invitation of the same Soviet institute.

Kim will arrive in Japan Wednesday morning for a one-day stopover during which he is scheduled to meet with Prime Minister Noboru Takeshita [title as received] and other Japanese leaders.

He is scheduled to return home Thursday afternoon.

Kim reportedly met with Gorbachev Wednesday evening in the Kremlin, the highlight of the Soviet trip, but it is yet to be confirmed by Kim himself.

Kim is likely to confirm his talks with the Soviet leader and unveil some contents of the discussion in a meeting with reporters inside the airplane on his way to Tokyo.

So far, Kim only mentioned that he met with an "important" Soviet figure and declined to elaborate on the matter.

ROK's Kim Yong-sam Cited on Soviet Ties

LD2703082690 Moscow TASS in English 0659 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 27 TASS—"Our meetings and talks with Soviet party and state leaders were a major step towards the normalisation of Soviet-South Korean realtions," Kim Yong-Sam, co-chairman of the South Korean ruling Democratic Liberal Party, stated here on Monday.

He is leading a South Korean parliamentary delegation visiting the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Institute of World Economy and International Relations of the Soviet Academy of Sciences.

During their stay in Moscow the guests met Soviet Communist Party Politburo member Aleksandr Yakovlev, Yevgeniy Primakov, chairman of the Council of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet and alternate member of the Politburo, as well as a number of other politicians, scientists and public figures.

Addressing the press conference, Kim said that agreements had been reached during the visit to expand interparliamentary contacts between the two countries and ties in the sphere of natural and social sciences.

Speaking about Soviet-South Korean relations, he pointed out that the two countries "had entered an entirely new stage in the history of their relationship," and the general direction of their normalisation efforts "is in line with the overall development of the world process." Kim pointed to the rapid development of Soviet-South Korean trade and economic relations and stressed that their pace is greater today than that of the development of political contacts.

"Politics should not be separated from economy, and we should go further. If both sides proceed from this assumption, their interests will be ensured, and they will be able to promote the cause of peace on the Korean peninsula, the peaceful unification of Korea and the consolidation of peace in Asia and throughout the world."

Kim called for the development of exchanges in all spheres between Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) and South Korea and of the need to create an atmosphere of mutual trust on the Korean peninsula. He reiterated his country's stand on the convocation of a conference to discuss the unification of Korea, in which representatives of the DPRK, South Korea, the Soviet Union, the United States, China and Japan would take part.

Responding to a TASS question about his stand on the presence of U.S. troops in South Korea, Kim said that "nobody wants foreign troops in his country's territory. I share this view, but in an atmosphere of the lack of necessary trust on the Korean peninsula I, like most of my compatriots, believe that U.S. military presence is necessary so far." At the same time, he pointed out that U.S. troops should not be an obstacle to the development of the North-South dialogue.

Kim Yong-sam and Vladlen Martynov, director of the Institute of World Economy and International Relations, signed a joint communique on the results of the visit of the South Korean delegation to the USSR which ends on March 27.

Frolov Receives Japanese Documentary-Makers

*PM2603095390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
24 Mar 90 Second Edition p 5*

[N. Krivomazov report: "Meeting at PRAVDA"]

[Text] NTV is one of the oldest and most influential TV companies in Japan. And the newspaper YOMIURI, which belongs to the same financial group, is one of the most popular newspapers in the Land of the Rising Sun with its circulation of almost 10 million.

NTV has been involved in many bold projects in its history, but there has perhaps never been one to equal the project with which the TV company's management is currently involved. Japanese TV journalists with the help of PRAVDA and the Socioeconomic Initiative Center set off in early spring on a major motor tour of the USSR—from the Pacific to the Baltic. The series of programs filmed during the motor expedition will be called "10,000 Kilometers of Perestroyka."

Yesterday K. Tokiwa, executive director of NTV, together with journalists from the TV company and YOMIURI, were the guests of our newspaper. I.T. Frolov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chief editor of PRAVDA, answered their numerous questions. Both sides agreed that cooperation between PRAVDA and NTV should be continued in the future to both sides' mutual advantage.

Near East & South Asia

Aeroflot Transport Plane Crashes in Kabul

*LD2703112690 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1050 GMT 27 Mar 90*

[Text] Kabul, 27 Mar (TASS)—An Aeroflot Il-76 transport aircraft carrying civilian cargo crashed at noon local time today on the approach to Kabul Airport. The fate of the crew and the causes of the catastrophe are being investigated.

Iran's Reaction to Lithuanian Incidents Noted

*NC2303091390 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress
in Persian to Iran 1530 GMT 23 Mar 90*

[Station commentary]

[Text] Reports published in the Iranian mass media show that the social and political circles of the Soviet Union's southern neighbor are following the incidents in and around Lithuania with special attention. There is speculation as to whether the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet's secessionist decision means the beginning of the Soviet Union's disintegration, as to whether the Soviet leadership's new political thinking can pass the Lithuanian test, and as to what the West's role is in these developments. Our commentator writes:

Of course the incidents in and around Lithuania also have international aspects. The issue is not only one of the reaction of foreign political and social circles to these incidents, but also of the international impact that the hasty and rash steps by the Lithuanian secessionists, which are destabilizing the political situation, will have.

I think the Iranians' interest in the incidents in and around Lithuania stems from the destabilizing impacts these incidents will have. But naturally one cannot sum up the entire issue in this way. World political, legal, and other problems are also reflected in the incidents on the Soviet Baltic coast. Involved here are the autonomy of peoples, the ability and vital strength of new political thinking, and the right of social choice and other fundamental problems.

It should be immediately stressed that the USSR Supreme Soviet and the other Soviet social organs and social circles do not doubt the Lithuanian people's right to autonomy to the extent of separating from the Soviet Government. But it is necessary to take into account the existence of many groups of people in Lithuania who support the expansion of national self-assertion and independence within the framework of the Soviet Union. These are the people who believe in this method for progress under the conditions of reconstruction.

The conclusion is that the issue of Lithuania's secession can only be solved after a referendum in the republic, taking into consideration the longstanding bonds and the close fabric of economic and social relations between Lithuania and other Soviet republics. But the Lithuanian secessionists are obstinately opposing this.

Some Iranian newspapers consider the advice by Western social and political dignitaries to the Soviet leadership on showing indulgence toward the secessionist demands by Lithuania as a type of pressure being exerted on the Soviet Union. KAYHAN INTERNATIONAL points out that such advice from Washington blatantly differs from the White House's stand on Moscow's introduction of a state of emergency in Azerbaijan. What can be said on this? First of all, the incidents in Lithuania are different from the incidents in Azerbaijan. In Lithuania these incidents did not take a violent turn and did not result in the seizure of power by resorting to force. This is why the reactions by the social organs to the incidents in these two republics were not the same.

As for the current U.S. stand on Lithuania, this is not very different from Washington's stand during the past few decades. As was the case before, this stand is characterized by prejudgements against the victory of the socialist structure in Lithuania. Nevertheless, the White House is sufficiently cautious; therefore, accusing it of exerting pressures seems inappropriate.

Second, some people in Iran are feigning ignorance and asking: Will the Soviet Union resort to suppressive measures against the Lithuanian secessionists, or will it retreat in the face of their deeds, words, and stubbornness? I think that this is a misleading and false variant or condition. The issue is the fate of the Lithuanian people and these people determine their future themselves. This is exactly the stand dictated by the new political thinking, which has become the pattern for the Soviet Government's domestic and foreign policy.

Report on Iranian Cosmonaut Denied

PM2203150590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by S. Leskov: "Long Wait for Space Flight"]

[Text] Citing Tehran radio, REUTER has reported that in Iran the Soviet-Iranian joint economic commission has discussed the question of a flight by an Iranian cosmonaut on a Soviet spaceship.

Your IZVESTIYA correspondent was told at the USSR Glavkosmos [Main Administration for the Creation and Utilization of Space Technology], a representative of which also took part in the commission's work, that at present it is premature to speak definitely of a flight by an Iranian cosmonaut. Only the first sounding out of a quite complex question has been done in Tehran. The Iranian side has ascertained the price required by the USSR Glavkosmos for the implementation of the entire package of services (about $10 million for the eight-day flight) and also the potential of the Soviet space ship and orbital station.

It must be said that recently quite a lot of countries have addressed the USSR Glavkosmos with the idea of a space flight. For the majority of countries this question is not so much scientific as political, after all having its own cosmonaut will considerably raise a state's prestige. The interest is obviously also explained by living memories of how the USSR used to "give rides" in space free of charge to almost everyone who wanted them. But now the USSR Glavkosmos (the chief is A.I. Dunayev) is firmly adhering to a commercial policy in joint space flights. And the price, although quite moderate, is forcing some applicants to weigh up their potential. For instance, not so long ago Malaysia deferred the idea of a space flight soon (the report on the talks with Malaysia leaked to the press)—after heavy flooding the country decided to use the funds for different purposes. Talks have so far gotten no further than the confidential exchange of opinions with a number of countries of Europe, Asia, and even Africa and it is premature to name the applicants.

As of now an agreement has been signed on joint manned flights on Soviet space ships by cosmonauts from Japan, Britain, Austria, and France. Thus, even if the question is resolved positively, an Iranian cosmonaut could only expect his turn to fly no earlier than 1993.

Supreme Soviet Delegation Pays Visit to PDRY

Arrives in Aden 26 Mar

LD2603163290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1536 GMT 26 Mar 90

[Text] Aden, 26 March (TASS)—A USSR Supreme Soviet delegation, headed by S.A. Niyazov, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Turkmen SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], and first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Turkmenistan, arrived here today on an official visit at the invitation of the Supreme People's Council of the PDRY [People's Democratic Republic of Yemen].

Visits N. Yemen

LD2603210490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1037 GMT 26 Mar 90

[Excerpts] Sana, 26 Mar (TASS)—From 21 to 26 March, a delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet led by S.A. Niyazov, deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Turkmenian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] and first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Turkmenia, was in the Yemen Arab Republic [YAR] on an official visit at the invitation of the YAR Consultative Council.

The delegation was received by Colonel A.A. Salih, president of the YAR, commander-in-chief of the Armed Forces, and secretary-general of the General People's Congress.

There was also a meeting with A.K. al-Arashi, speaker of the Consultative Council, member of the Permanent Committee of the General People's Congress, [titles as received] and other leading YAR officials.

[Passage omitted: wreath-laying, talks with deputies on Yemeni unity, Soviet presidential rule, improved international climate, Middle East problem, Soviet-N. Yemeni relations]

The delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet expressed its gratitude for the warmth and hospitality displayed to it during its stay in the Yemen Arab Republic, and conveyed an invitation to the delegation of the Consultative Council to pay the Soviet Union an official visit. The time of the visit will be agreed separately.

Palestinian Trade Union Delegation Visits

90UI0449A Moscow TRUD in Russian 15 Mar 90 p 1

[Unattributed article: "On the Basis of Solidarity"]

[Text] From 7 through 14 March 1990 at the invitation of the AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions] a delegation from the Federation of Trade Unions of Palestine headed by its general secretary, Kheydar Ibragim, made a friendly working visit to the USSR. The delegation also included the deputy general secretaries of the Federation of Trade Unions of Palestine, Khaleb Abdel Gani and Fuad Abdalla.

The Palestinian trade union delegation visited Moscow and Leningrad, learned about the life of Soviet workers and the practical activity of USSR trade unions, and had numerous meetings and conversations with trade union leaders and activists. The delegation had a productive meeting in the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

During the course of the visit primary attention was devoted to meetings and negotiations in the AUCCTU with the participation of AUCCTU Chairman S.A. Shalayev and AUCCTU Deputy Chairman G.I. Yanayev. Within the framework of the negotiations they discussed the crucial problems of modernity and the international trade union movement and questions of further development of friendly bilateral relations, and the parties informed one another of the basic areas in the work of the two trade union organizations.

AUCCTU representatives informed their guests in detail about the ongoing process of all-around renewal of the life of Soviet society, the growing role and position of trade unions in this restructuring process and the deep changes within the country's trade union movement itself, whose center of attention is focused on protection of the workers' interests.

The Palestinian delegation, in turn, gave information about their activity to protect the vital interests of the Palestinian workers and to support the courageous intifadah in the occupied Arab territories which has continued for more than two years and about the paths and prospects for fair and universal regulation in the Near East. Having discussed in detail the negative consequences of the European emigration to Israel, which has become stronger recently, both sides condemned the expansionist policy of moving settlers to the occupied Arab land while crowding out the indigenous Palestinian population. The parties are in favor of a fair and general regulation in the Near East based on decisions of the United Nations and within the framework of the International Conference on the Near East with the participation of all interested parties and the five permanent members of the UN Security Council. They condemn the harsh methods of suppressing the Palestinian intifadah and the repressive measures against the civilian population on the occupied Arab territories. Both organizations call for the United States and the countries of West Europe to take a more constructive position in the matter of achieving peace in the Near East. The AUCCTU confirmed its unwavering solidarity and support of the just struggle of the Palestinian people under the leadership of the United Nations—its only legitimate representative—in defense of its national interests and its inalienable right to self-determination and independent development.

The parties confirmed their desire to further strengthen traditional friendly ties and earmarked concrete measures in this area. They also agreed upon close interaction in the international arena and, as necessary, conducting joint consultations and joint actions in connection with issues that are of mutual interest.

The Federation of Trade Unions of Palestine delegation expressed its gratitude for the warm reception it received in the USSR and wished the Soviet workers and trade unions success in the restructuring and renewal of the life of their country based on principles of humane, democratic socialism.

Polyakov Cited on Visit to Arabian Peninsula

LD2303201290 Moscow International Service in Arabic 1500 GMT 23 Mar 90

[Text] A few days ago, Vladimir Polyakov, head of the Near East and North African Countries Administration, returned from a tour in a number of countries of the Arabian Peninsula. His tour was the subject of considerable interest from Arab and international information media. Our correspondent met the eminent Soviet diplomat, and asked him to answer a few questions. The correspondent asked Vladimir Polyakov: What are the aims of this tour? Can one say that the consultations between the various sides have led to understanding regarding the questions proposed for discussions?

[Begin Polyakov recording in Russian, fading into Arabic translation] My tour in the Middle East took place during the increased efficiency of the Soviet policy aimed at resolving conflicts and preserving the long and lasting peace heeded by the peoples of the region, as well as promoting and deepening Soviet-Arab relations. In the context of my tour, I visited Saudi Arabia and the two halves of Yemen where discussions covered a wide ensemble of issues, including the question of the emigration of Soviet Jews to Israel. I informed the Arab statesmen that the Soviet Union, in accordance with new political thinking, is introducing amendments to its laws so that they may accord with international law. In particular, a law is being prepared which provides for the freedom of entry and leave for Soviet citizens, irrespective of their national origins.

I have spoken to Arab statesmen on the steps taken by the Soviet Union in light of the intention of the Israeli authorities to settle migrants in the occupied Arab lands. We regard these acts as illegal that violate the documents of international law which forbid the alteration of the demographic character of territories occupied temporarily. Arab statesmen in the countries I have visited were informed about Soviet positions regarding a settlement in the Middle East. Our country is interested in making full use of the positive elements that transpired in the position of the PLO, and in the position of the Arab states that effectively seek a peaceful process in the region.

At the same time, participants in the encounters have underlined the inadequate response to the constructive steps taken by the Arabs on the part of Israel which is still obstructing a just solution to the Palestinian issue, and opposing the realization of a comprehensive settlement of the Middle East crisis through an international conference under United Nations patronage. [end recording]

Then the Radio Moscow correspondent asked the Soviet diplomat the following question: The visits by our country's officials to Riyadh are still regarded as rare events, and for this reason each of these visits arouses a great deal of interest inside and outside the Arab world. This was the case this time too. What can you say about your encounters and contacts in Saudi Arabia?

[Begin Polyakov recording in Russian, fading into Arabic translation] This is the second visit to Saudi Arabia by me personally in recent times. I met Foreign Minister Prince Sa'ud al-Faysal, and his assistant, Abd al-Rahman Mansur, as well as other senior officials. I found the necessary interest in Riyadh on the part of officials and information media alike. For example, I was asked through Saudi Television on the life of Soviet Muslims. In the course of the encounters with Saudi diplomats, talks covered the pressing issues of the Middle East, and I explained in detail our position on their just settlement. The Saudi side has showed understanding.

I informed the officials of the Saudi Foreign Ministry on the situation in Afghanistan and around it. I told them that the Soviet Union is persuaded that today there exist favorable conditions to stop the civil war in Afghanistan, which is taking the lives of thousands of innocent people. One must say that there are differences between the Soviet and Saudi positions concerning a solution to the Afghan problem, and realization of reconciliation between the parties to the conflict in Afghanistan.

I informed the Saudi statesmen on the process of restructuring in the Soviet Union which started at the initiative of Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev. The Saudi side showed high appreciation for the process of the spread of democracy and transparence in the Soviet Union, wishing the leaders and peoples of our country great success on this road.

Concerning Soviet-Saudi bilateral relations, I want to stress that a continuous exchange of written letters has been organized between Mikhail Gorbachev and King Fahd, and also between the foreign ministers of both countries, Eduard Shevardnadze and Prince Sa'ud al-Faysal. [end recording]

Recently, the process has been growing of reunification of the two halves of Yemen. How do you assess this operation in the light of consultations you held in Sana'a and Aden?

[Begin Polyakov recording in Russian, fading into Arabic translation] During my visit to the Yemen Arab Republic I was received by President Ali Abdullah Salih and by Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister Abd al-Karim al-Iryani. I was briefed on the process of reunification of the two halves of Yemen, both of which have relations of friendship and cooperation with the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union supports this process which will serve the issue of progress and prosperity of the Yemeni people, and will reinforce the climate of stability and peace in the Arabian peninsula.

We see in this the task of the movement toward the unity of Yemen, and the leaders of the two Yemeni states are making their utmost now to lay down the common political structure for the future unified Yemen. Naturally, during encounters with statesmen of both south and north Yemen, discussions covered issues of promoting their relations with the Soviet Union.

During these encounters there transpired a common wish to exert all efforts to expand and deepen these relations in the spirit of the traditions of old friendship. [end recording]

Broadcasting Protocol Signed With Morocco

LD2303101690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1658 GMT 22 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, 22 Mar (TASS)—A working protocol was signed in Moscow today on cooperation in the area of television and radio broadcasting during 1990-91 between the USSR Gosteleradio [State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting] and Moroccan radio and television.

The document provides for a broader exchange of television and radio material on the lives of the Soviet and Moroccan peoples, and for mutual assistance in the preparation of programs on important events in the USSR and Morocco.

The protocol was signed by Petr Reshetov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Gosteleradio, and Mohamed Tricha, general director of Moroccan radio and television.

Morocco's ambassador to the USSR, Rafik Haddaoui, was present at the signing ceremony.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Shevardnadze Ends African Visit, Returns Home

Ends Visit to Nigeria, Africa

LD2603172190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1556 GMT 26 Mar 90

[TASS special correspondents Nikolay Shartse and Georgiy Shmelov report]

[Text] Lagos, 26 Mar (TASS)—E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign affairs minister completing a trip to a number of countries of Africa, was in Nigeria on a working visit where he met I. Babangida, president of the country. Greetings from M.S. Gorbachev, USSR president, and wishes for prosperity for the people of Nigeria, were conveyed to the president.

I. Babangida expressed sincere hopes for the success of the program of transformations in the USSR which is being carried out with great courage and conviction, (and said that) Nigerians are deeply sympathetic toward the program which carries a huge positive charge which is the moving force of many positive changes in the world.

E.A. Shevardnadze spoke of the Soviet Union's activities to improve the international climate and to reduce the burden of weapons. Namely, it is the reduction of military expenditures along with the work to create a new economic order which is the way in which the most painful problems of development can be resolved. I. Babangida, welcoming the Soviet peace initiatives, stated that the USSR has an ally on the African continent in the shape of Nigeria.

E.A. Shevardnadze analyzed the results of his numerous contacts in the course of his trip around the south of Africa. They show that the desire for peace is growing in the region and that the necessary prerequisites are being created for this. I. Babangida agreed that there is no military solution to the problems in the south of Africa and that dialogue is the best weapon there. Nigeria positively assesses Soviet-U.S. mutual understanding on the need to lower tension in the south of Africa and considers the meetings which the USSR foreign affairs minister had with N. Mandela, vice president of the African National Congress and F.de Klerk, president of the Republic of South Africa, to be highly useful.

E.A. Shevardnadze and I. Babangida expressed satisfaction with the traditions of close cooperation and mutual understanding in Soviet-Nigerian relations. The Nigerian people, the president said, will always be grateful to the Soviet Union for its firm support in years of trial and for its substantial aid in the period of development. E.A. Shevardnadze confirmed that the Soviet Union would in future, too, give special attention to all-round expansion and further improvement of its relations with the developing countries, including, of course, Nigeria.

At the present stage, in the opinion of both sides, Soviet-Nigerian relations may be set still larger-scale tasks, in keeping with the role in the world of the Soviet Union and Nigeria—the giant of Africa, a country possessing an impressive economic potential and considerable authority on the international arena. A meeting of the leaders of the two countries might give Soviet-Nigerian relations of new quality.

On behalf of M.S. Gorbachev, the invitation was conveyed to the president of Nigeria to pay an official visit to the Soviet Union. The invitation was accepted with gratitude.

Gives Final News Conference

LD2603171190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1442 GMT 26 Mar 90

[Text] Lagos, 26 Mar (TASS)—E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign affaris minister, made the following statement today at a press conference at the end of his working visit to Nigeria:

Ladies and gentlemen!

Our trip around Africa comes to an end today. After the press conference we are leaving by air for home. It remains for us to travel the final section of our route which will have covered a total of 27,000 kilometers.

In the nine days of our visit, the first visit to tropical Africa by a foreign affairs minister of the Soviet Union in history, we have been to seven countries and had a total of 22 meetings with their leaders and ministers of foreign affairs, and with our colleagues from African and European states and from the United States.

These figures reflect the intensity of the contacts and the volume of the work load, but it goes without saying that for us the qualitative and substantive aspect of the matter is more important.

Before I talk about that, let me give some explanations.

We came to Africa by a route long since selected as one of the most important by the Soviet Union's foreign policy.

It is the route of promoting decolonization and of providing moral, political and material support for peoples striving to achieve their natural right to freedom of choice.

However, given that this is an old route, we are making amendments to it today. Amendments have been dictated by perestroyka and the new political thinking. It is not rigid ideological markers that have been erected along that route today but the guidelines of common human values. They propose dialogue in the name of unity as a counterbalance to an emphasis on contradictions which deepen confrontation.

We are well aware now that no one wins from this, not our people, not the Africans, whatever "camp" they may belong to, nor the world as a whole, and that turning entire continents into an arena for the East-West struggle under banners of ideological irreconcilability not only brings deprivation to the peoples of those continents—but it hits at the vital interests, of the people of East and West.

In the Soviet Union we are convinced that not one single global problem on a scale common to the whole of mankind can be resolved successfuly without the participation of the African states, and without taking into consideration the importance of the African factor in the destinies of the world.

We came to this region in order to take part in the celebrations of Namibian independence.

The independence of Namibia is a classic model of the effectiveness of dialogue between worlds which were absolutely incompatible until recently. It is dear to us not only because the international community has gained its 160th fellow—it is enriched by the priceless experience of overcoming borders of hostility, mistrust and suspicion. Namibia's acquisition of independence makes the world wiser and richer. It is different now and could scarcely be again what it used to be.

This victory of the Namibian people, of the Frontline states, is our victory too for it once more attests that a line which has cast off mountains of dead dogmatic concepts is correct.

It is the victory of the United Nations Organization which has been able to demonstrate and prove that the principles and ideals of its Charter are not merely the eloquent letter of worldwide law but an effective instrument of practical peace-making politics.

New supreme technology is now in the hands of the international community and when it comes to use it once again their will be more confidence in its success and less pessimism.

Finally, Namibia's independence is the victory of reason in states which only recently still favored the preservation of a lasting order of things. Healthy forces have prevailed over the recklessness of oppressing other peoples and have opened the way to free development, not only for those peoples but for themselves as well.

But they have taken only the first steps on this road, and whether they will occupy a place in the world community depends on their future steps.

We have overcome such a big distance not only for the sake of participating in festivities. This is work, and extremely complicated work, which is being carried out at a moment crucial for mankind.

African states have many problems of their own, and we have had with their leaders honest conversation about these problems. But it has continually been going outside the confines of the continent and most often the initiative in this has belonged to our interlocutors. They would touch upon East European problems, the process of building German unity, the destinies of perestroyka and the events in the internal life of the Soviet Union in the most direct and immediate connection with the situation in Africa, with the destinies and future of their own countries and peoples. We were asked many questions, but more often than others, and with the tones of serious concern, this one was heard: How will what is happening in Europe and the Soviet Union affect African affairs, how will it influence them?

A difficult question, and there is no simple answer to it. But for all that, personally for me it displays the world's acknowledgement of the interlinked nature of its component parts: What happens in one part inevitably reverberates in another. Therefore, in conditions of rapid changes whose consequences are not always predictable, there is a great danger of the dialogue being wound down, of a return to the times of confrontation, of mistrust, of the arms race, from which everyone suffers, but most of all—the developing countries.

Sometimes we hear voices in which one hears the question: But hasn't the Soviet Union turned away from the developing world? By way of self-criticism I will say this: If one looks at the matter from the viewpoint of visits and contacts, then there is an element of truth in this. The intensive quality of ties has indeed declined somewhat. But not for long. There is but one reason for this: We have decided to concentrate our efforts in the first place upon those problems which, if they are not resolved, will in our opinion mean that it is impossible to assist the developing world in a real way. It is a question of eliminating the material foundations of confrontation and inequality; of removing the potential threats of nuclear disaster which hang over the whole of mankind, and the causes of the arms race which brings all countries to ruin; of settling regional conflicts; and of creating the prerequisites for the construction of a just economic order and the formation of an atmosphere in which it is possible to consolidate the efforts of the world community as it confronts the global challenges of the times.

For this it was necessary to overcome distrust and to move over from confrontation to dialogue and then from cooperation to interaction.

I think that in many respects we and our partners have managed to do this. And it is not without foundation that we now consider that what is taking place now both here and in the South of Africa in general is also the result of the restructuring of international relations upon the basis of the new political thinking.

It is, however, early days to be celebrating a definitive victory. I agree with those I have talked to who maintain that even now that Namibia has gained its independence, security in the region remains fragile. Domestic wars are continuing in Angola and Mozambique, and apartheid has not surrendered its positions, although the Pretoria regime is showing a readiness for dialogue. My impressions have perhaps not yet settled down, but I have seen for myself just how dreadfully tired people are of wars which milk their national economies of tens of thousands of millions of dollars not to mention enormous human casualties and suffering. Yes, the achievements of the revolution must be defended, but the situation sometimes arises whereby a continuation of armed domestic conflicts and clashes becomes a factor that threatens it. Whereby the best means of defense is not weapons, but dialogue. Particularly when there is no military solution to domestic problems, as we were told in Angola and Mozambique.

The time has come to work for a peaceful settlement and to promote the policy of national reconciliation in Africa, too. Here a constructive role could be played by a consolidation of all countries in the region and by their interaction with the Soviet Union and other countries, whose potential should not be ignored. When the interests of many parties are affected, one cannot do without talks and sensible compromises.

I was convinced of this yet again during the meetings I had in the region with the leaders of the "Frontline" state and our counterparts from other countries, when I discovered a great and positive flexibility in what they said.

Some of these meetings, for example, with U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker and FRG Foreign Minister H-D. Genscher, with whom we also discussed ways of resolving the German question, were traditional ones for us. Others, like the one with President de Klerk of South Africa, were being held for the first time. I got the impression that he sincerely wants racial peace in his country. It was a happy moment for us to shake Nelson Mandela's hand and to congratulate him on his release and the fact that he has today headed the movement for a democratic, nonracial South Africa. The conversation with this remarkable man, who is the recognized leader of his people, has strengthened our belief in the possibility of eliminating apartheid by dialogue alone, provided the parties involved respect each other's rights and the rights of every citizen of this country.

At the same time we called for the continuation of efforts by the international community to facilitate the dismantling of this disgraceful system.

On the credit side of our visit we also list the signing of the communique on the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and Namibia. I have been pleased to convey M.S. Gorbachev's message of greetings to President Nujoma.

Also extremely substantive was our meeting in Lagos with President Babangida of Nigeria, to whom we conveyed an invitation to visit the Soviet Union, and the talks with my Nigerian counterpart Lukman went successfully. We revealed a complete coincidence of view on all key questions of presentday international life.

Now the task consists in bringing Soviet-Nigerian relations up to a new, higher level, worthy of the place, weight and role of Nigeria in the world arena. We need not simply, and not only, diplomatic relations, but friendly, I would say partner-like relations, presupposing close interaction on bilateral, regional, global levels. I think that in the course of today we have made progress in this direction.

All these days we have felt an unbreakable, living link with the fatherland. Each of us continually faced the question: Have we the right to be far from home, where now not all is well? Should we be tackling problems of southern Africa, when our perestroyka today has such difficult problems? We found the answer from our interlocutors—all without exception. One of them said to us: If you are here perestroyka must be continuing.

Allow me to end here. I am ready to answer your questions.

More on Lagos News Conference

LD2703110890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0646 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] Lagos, 27 Mar (TASS)—At a press conference that took place here, E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of foreign affairs, answered questions from journalists.

Question: Now that the Soviet Union is leaving the world's "hot spots", do you not think that this will put your allies in a perilous position and will make them some kind of victim at the negotiating table? And the second question: What concrete accords were achieved during the talks with the Nigerian side?

Answer: I have already said in my statement that now that times are different in international life and the development of civilization, a new quality has been attained in relations between states. A departure from the "norms" of military confrontation is beginning, to a considerable degree. This very important factor promotes the development of internal dialogue in countries overwhelmed by conflicts, including Angola and Mozambique. This is the first point.

The second point. Our friends have enough forces and possibilities to defend revolutionary gains with arms, but this is not their choice. They favor dialogue, peaceful settlement, and national reconciliation.

Regarding concrete accords, we did not set ourselves such a task.

Of course, the main concrete accord is on the Nigerian president's future visit to the Soviet Union. Also, we agreed on the foreign minister's visit to the USSR and agreed to start serious preparatory work for these visits. Undoubtedly, the Nigerian president's visit to the USSR will become an important event in our relations. We also discussed other problems of bilateral cooperation. As is well known, the Soviet Union is taking part in the construction of the metallurgy works in Ajaokuta and in the implementation of other projects. In our talks, we also mapped out other areas of economic cooperation and felt that the Nigerian leadership wishes to develop scientifc and technical links with us, too, and even to cooperate in space exploration.

Question: You spoke about your meeting with U.S. Secretary of State Baker and RSA President de Klerk. What could you undertake for dismantling apartheid and settling the conflict in southern Africa?

And another question. In your speech you mentioned the complex situation in the Soviet Union, the situation in Lithuania which is particularly sensitive and complex for you. Your government thought it necessary to make a show of force. Tell us, please, is it possible to avoid using force?

Answer: The first question first. Following my meeting with the U.S. secretary of state in Windhoek, he went on to visit South Africa. I believe that when we meet again in Washington in a few days—on 4 April—we will have the chance to exchange impressions.

So, wherein lies the overall task? In helping the progressive forces of that country achieve the elimination of apartheid. The countries of Europe, the Soviet Union, the United States, and the countries of the region all have such opportunities. They must be utilized to the full. I am certain that the dismantling of apartheid will be a very major event at the end of our century. We have no doubts as to the reality of this task.

Now, on the subject of events in the Soviet Union, including in Lithuania. I should say straight out that they are giving rise to concern among us. At the same time, I must say in all frankness that we are not banking on force. Additional troops have not been sent into the republic. Preference is being given to that most powerful of weapons—normal, civilized dialogue. And in that sense we have no intention of disarming.

Question: Here in Nigeria we are concerned over the situation in East Europe. Bearing in mind the changes that are occurring in that region, how do you see the future of the Warsaw Pact? Particularly given that NATO would like to incorporate a unified Germany?

I would also ask you for a clarification of your answer to the previous question. Article 72 of the USSR Constitution provides for the right of union republics to leave the USSR. Why in that case is the situation in Lithuania giving rise to such acute problems?

Answer: Before flying off on my tour of southern Africa I took part in the Prague meeting of the committee of Warsaw Pact Foreign Ministers. We spoke of the need to improve the Warsaw Pact as a military-political alliance with a view to transforming it into a politico-military alliance. In other words, we were speaking about bringing its political rather than its military aspects to the fore. We hope the NATO countries will set themselves the same task. What we need here is a countermovement. I believe many NATO countries realize this.

The hardest question is the military-political status of a future unified Germany. Or rather, a unified Germany's membership in the military-political alliances. The Western states maintain that the unified Germany should become a member of NATO. As a hospitable people, we could suggest incorporating Germany into the Warsaw Pact. I doubt if that would suit the West.

In order to find a mutually acceptable solution, a special negotiating mechanism has been set up. This consists of the four great powers and the two German states. Work has begun. The next sitting will show just how viable this mechanism is. In any case, we are banking on its working successfully.

Now, about the right of the republics to self-determination. Yes, there is such an article in the Constitution. No doubt, however, you are also aware of something else: that the draft for a new constitution is now being developed, taking into account the great changes that are taking place in the USSR, including in the republics.

I suppose that it will determine the political mechanism for a republic's secession from membership in the union. For the moment, the current Constitution enshrines the right to secede from the union but does not indicate how to go about it. The draft of such a law is currently being discussed at the Supreme Soviet. It is being discussed fairly vigorously. I think that such a law will be adopted in the very near future.

Question: Reforms are being implemented in the Soviet Union, a process of transformation is under way and Mikhail Gorbachev has been elected the first president of the USSR with the most extensive powers. Does all this mean that the Soviet Union is moving away from socialism and toward capitalism? Secondly, there is no Soviet ambassador in Lagos at the moment. When might we expect the appointment of a new plenipotentiary representative of your country?

Answer: An expansive reply on the topic of the economic and political reforms in the USSR could take up a great deal of our time.

Putting it briefly, a new economic mechanism has been founded and a series of new and fundamental laws has been developed. This work has been nearly concluded. In the next two to three years we anticipate gaining returns and improving the economy of the country. Reform of the political system is under way also and the principle of political pluralism has been acknowledged. There are other serious innovations, too. The main trend is unchanged: the process of democratizing society and the state is under way. The institution of presidential power should also be seen within the framework of that process. A democratic country, too, needs strong power in order to defend democracy. As for your claims that the Soviet Union is moving away from socialism and toward capitalism, I have not heard that. There is no movement toward capitalism. We intend to build a society of genuine socialism. We intend to and are convinced that we can implement the ideals of socialism within the Soviet Union but at the same time we do not want to ignore the experience of the capitalist states. They do have some things of interest. There is high labor productivity, a high level of technology, the scientific and technical revolution, and rational business organization. We are studying this experience and intend to take on board everything that is most interesting and most useful. Can we call this process a move toward capitalism? Certainly not.

The answer to the second question is very simple: A new Soviet ambassador has already been appointed and will come to Nigeria in a few days or weeks. He is a good and interesting person. His name is Oleg Ivanovich Bocharov.

Question: The events known as glasnost and perestroyka show that the Soviet leadership may not have foreseen all the consequences of its policy. If you could start everything anew would you pursue the same course or would you choose the path of gradual reforms?

Another question: You are the first USSR foreign minister to have visited Africa. Does that mean that the Soviet Union did not see Africa as deserving priority attention in its foreign policy? Why did it take so much time for this visit to take place?

Answer: I can acknowledge openly and in a self-critical way that at the start it was almost impossible to foresee all the difficulties and problems that we subsequently encountered. It is no mere coincidence that what is happening in the Soviet Union has been called a revolution. And there are no revolutions without difficulties and contradictions. But we are overcoming them and have no doubt that we shall finish what we have started. And if we started everything anew then we would act just as we did in April 1985 when we defined our course toward democratization, perestroyka, and new political thinking.

On the visit to Africa. I accept any criticism on this score: the visit really could have taken place earlier. But surely it is not the only thing that matters? The Soviet Union has always given support to national liberation movements in Africa, including this region and the south of Africa. We have many friends here. We have given them political, material, and moral assistance. In other words, we have compensated for the lack of trips here by our policy of support and assistance.

Question: You have actively adopted the doctrine of defense sufficiency. Do you now rely on the possibility of delivering a second strike?

Second question: Concerning talks with the United States on arms reduction and all concrete agreements that have already been signed in this area, despite these agreements the growth in military expenditure, including spending on scientific research and developing new weapons, is continuing. So then, are these agreements simply a screen behind which to replace old weapons with new ones?

Answer: I can see no connection between the first and second part of your initial question. What second strike do you mean? As for the doctrine of defense sufficiency, or as it is also called, the nonoffensive doctrine, we have adopted it and are implementing it. In essence, we have already begun to build our Armed Forces on the basis of it. But our partners too should adopt the same doctrine. This question is now being discussed in Europe. All states, and especially those possessing major military potential, should be guided by the principle of defense sufficiency. They should have as many weapons as they need for defense. In other words, it is a question of removing their capacity for offensive operations. That indeed is the basis for disarmament and for progress in this area in the future too.

On Soviet-U.S. talks, this process is continuous. An agreement has been signed on medium and shorter-range missiles. Preparations are under way for an agreement on cutting by half strategic offensive weapons, and also on cutting back on conventional weapons in Europe. I do not agree with your assertion on increased expenditure: your information is inaccurate. In recent times it has dropped sharply in the USSR—within the bounds of 14 percent. That includes scientific research, too.

This problem is being actively debated in the United States. For the United States it is becoming more and more difficult to finance large-scale military programs: the possibilities for even such a country are not without limit.

How will the real cuts to military expenditure in the United States take place? That question should not be put to me. In that respect our intentions are sincere: We truly wish to overcome military confrontation; to free resources for economic development, for solving urgent problems of life not only in our own country but everywhere.

Departs for Home

LD2603172890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1652 GMT 26 Mar 90

[Text] Lagos, 26 Mar (TASS)—Having completed a working visit to Nigeria, Eduard Shevardnadze, USSR foreign affairs minister, left Lagos on Monday for Moscow.

During his nine-day trip around Africa he visited seven countries—Angola, Zambia, Namibia, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Tanzania and Nigeria.

This was the first visit by the USSR foreign affairs minister to the countries of tropical Africa.

At Lagos airport Eduard Shevardnadze was seen off by Rilwanu Lukman, Nigeria's external affairs minister and other officials.

Joint Soviet-Nigerian Communique Issued

LD2603194190 Moscow TASS in English 1848 GMT 26 Mar 90

[By TASS correspondents Nikolay Shartse and Georgiy Shmele]

[Text] Lagos March 26 TASS—Joint Soviet-Nigerian communique was adopted here today on the completion of Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze's two-day working visit to Nigeria. Follows the text of the joint communique:

The minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR Mr. Eduard Shevardnadze, paid a two-day visit to Nigeria from 25th to 26th March, 1990. He was received by General Ibrahim Babangida, president and commander-in-chief of the Armed Forces of Nigeria. He also had extensive and wide-ranging discussions with the minister of external affairs of Nigeria, Dr. Rilwanu Lukman, on a number of bilateral and international issues of mutual interest to the two countries.

Both sides agreed to build upon the existing friendly relations between the two countries based on cooperation and mutual respect. To this end, the Soviet foreign minister extended an invitation from the president of the Soviet Union, Mr. M.S. Gorbachev, to President Ibrahim Babangida to visit the USSR. The president accepted the invitation and it was agreed that the visit would take place on a mutually acceptable date to be agreed upon between the two sides through diplomatic channels. Both sides agreed that the visit would provide impetus for the development to a higher level of the relations between the two countries.

On bilateral relations the two sides agreed to give special attention to economic cooperation. To this end, they expressed determination to work out and sign an investment promotion and protection agreement, treaty on legal assistance and agreement for cooperation in science and technology. They also agreed to sign a protocol on political consultations and a consular agreement between the two countries. Both sides resolved to ensure early completion of the Ajaokuta steel project. They also agreed to promote bilateral trade. All these matters would be discussed at the forthcoming inaugural meeting of the USSR/Nigeria intergovernmental joint commission for cooperation.

Both sides reviewed the political situation in South Africa and noted the developments that have taken place including the proposed dialogue between Southern African regime, the ANC [African National Congress] and other anti-apartheid organisations. It was agreed that the pressure on South African Government and support for anti-apartheid in the country should be intensified until apartheid is dismantled and democratic society emerges in South Africa.

Expressing delight at the independence of Namibia they both called for international support and assistance to enable the country to consolidate its political and economic independence and preserve its territorial integrity.

Referring to Angola and Mozambique, both sides expressed their opinion on the necessity for further efforts towards finding a peaceful settlement of the internal conflicts in the two countries.

Both sides discussed other regional conflicts, including the Middle East, Afghanistan and Cambodia and expressed the hope that peace would return to these areas.

Both sides noted the progress made in the negotiations toward global peace and security and welcomed the prospects of diverting the huge expenditure in arms race to economic and social development.

At the end of the visit Mr. Eduard Shevardnadze, the Soviet foreign minster, expressed profound gratitude for the warm, welcome and hospitality extended to him and his delegation in the course of his visit. He extended an invitation to the Nigerian minister of external affairs, Dr. Rilwanu Lukman, to visit the Soviet Union. The invitation was accepted with pleasure.

Commentary Views Shevardnadze Trip to Africa

MB2303121190 Moscow in English to Southern Africa 1900 GMT 22 Mar 90

[Commentary by Igor Potovskyi—read by announcer]

[Text] This is the first trip to Africa by a Soviet Foreign Minister. His program is extremely intense. Eduard Shevardnadze has already conferred with Angolan officials in Luanda and had several meetings with the leaders of the ANC [African National Congress] also in Zambia. The centerpiece of this tour was diplomatic activity in Windhoek where festivities took place on the occasion of proclaiming Namibian independence.

The range of issues already discussed and to be discussed during his Africa tour is wide: A peaceful settlement in Angola and Mozambique. Prospects for relations between the USSR and independent Namibia. Developments in South Africa and their possible evolution. Serious economic problems faced by the continent, as well as European and global politics.

It's hard to say what is the focus of the trip since many issues it involves are closely interconnected. The tour of the Soviet foreign minister, as such, is a recognition of new realities in a rapidly changing world. Even before his departure from Moscow, Eduard Shevardnadze said, to be guided by old notions is inadmissible. There is a need for new forms of cooperation, new forms of interaction with Africa.

This relates not only to economics but also to politics in the first place. This does not involve the fundamental change in the Soviet policy towards one or another country or organization. The Soviet foreign minister has reaffirmed its previous policy of support for the Angolan Government's endeavors aimed at stopping hostilities in the country. He declared that his government's policy towards the ANC was invariable. The difference lies in the role played by the great powers and in the extent of (?UN) involvement in African affairs at a time when prospects for peace and stability have become real at last.

The past few days have shown convincingly that the Soviet and American political presidents can serve not only as stimulus for conflicts but as an incentive for settling them. The meeting Eduard Shevardnadze and the president of Angola, their contacts with the United States Secretary of State, James Baker, the subsequent meeting between President dos Santos and his South African counterpart, Frederik de Klerk, the conversation between President de Klerk and the Soviet foreign minister, and the upcoming trip to Zaire by James Baker, have already enabled most analysts to start speaking about much greater prospects for peace in Angola.

According to Eduard Shevardnadze, the proclaiming of Namibian independence will be greatly condusive to achieving a settlement in Angola. It is generally believed that this is perhaps the most significant example of positive cooperation between the two superpowers.

The Namibian factor will undoubtedly have an impact on the prospects of ending the war in Mozambique. A brief visit to Mozambique is what the Soviet foreign minister is engaged in today. The main topic of his talk says; prospects for a peaceful settlement. On the whole is it clear that stability in the region will depend most of all on the development in events in South Africa.

The Western press have published their own interpretation of the statement made by Eduard Shevardnadze in Lusaka. They saw in the continuation of support for the ANC an intention to go on with arms supplies to that organization. They seem to forget that now the Soviet Union gives priority to nonviolent means of resolving conflicts. Secondly, Moscow's stand is well known. The policy to be pursued by the ANC must be determined by the ANC alone.

According to the Soviet Foreign Minister, Moscow is ready to do all it can to promote the dialogue between Pretoria and South Africa's democratic forces. In this light great attention has been attracted by Eduard Shevardnazde's meetings with Nelson Mandela and particularly with President de Klerk.

That was the first in many years' contact between the two countries on so high a level. The Soviet Foreign Minister described his conversation with President de Klerk as constructive and this gave rise to justified optimism.

Post-Independence Security Fears for Namibia Noted

PM2203164390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent M. Pavlov dispatch: "Namibia: View From Luanda"]

[Text] Luanda—For a short while Windhoek, Namibia's administrative center, became the capital of diplomatic contacts and talks.

International observers are voicing fears regarding the possible complication of the situation in Namibia following the proclamation of independence, in view of the fact that the country still does not have its own armed forces, police, and security service necessary for these purposes. Reports are coming in that the Democratic Turnhalle Alliance [DTA]— the main rival of the South-West African People's Organization [SWAPO]—is still in "open" opposition (it has refused to introduce its representative into S. Nujoma's government) in order to complicate the implementation of SWAPO's policy.

With this in view the DTA is continuing to finance the South-West African Territory Forces, which have officially been disbanded.

It is also reported that members of the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola [UNITA] grouping are infiltrating Namibian territory from Angola in order to carry out terrorist acts of sabotage. Incidentally, DTA leaders invited Savimbi, the grouping's leader, to the Namibian independence celebrations. Western colleagues say that the UNITA leader allegedly refused to attend this ceremony, but they do not rule out the presence of a delegation from the aforementioned grouping in Windhoek. SWAPO's enemies may also use former members of the "Koevoet" goon battalion for their own ends. Moreover, the presence of large stocks of weapons—both officially registered and stashed away in caches—is also a serious factor leading to tension. It is being used to whip up tribal clashes and intimidate whites with SWAPO's black nationalism.

Statements issued by SWAPO's leaders indicate that Namibia is still loyal to and friendly with the Soviet Union, which offered its people invaluable aid during their struggle against colonialism. This was also mentioned in the Angolan Government statement circulated in Luanda the day before Namibian independence was proclaimed.

Commentary Links Namibian Peace, Area Stability

MB2403094590 Moscow in English to Southern Africa 1900 GMT 23 Mar 90

[Aleksandr Fedorov commentary—read by announcer]

[Text] Namibia and the Soviet Union have decided to establish diplomatic relations and to exchange embassies.

A communique to that effect was signed in Windhoek by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and the foreign minister of the Republic of Namibia, Ben Gurirab.

The communique [word indistinct] the long history of relations between the Soviet and Namibian people, relations that were not played out according to scripts based on diplomatic etiquette. Their sincerity and unselfishness were tested by time and the hard fight of the last colony on the African Continent for freedom.

No matter how important the issues before the United Nations, for the Soviet Union they never eclipsed the decolonization of Namibia. It took years of courageous struggle for the Namibian people and a considerable improvement of the international climate before the principles of the United Nations declaration in granting colonial countries and people's independence, based on the initiative of the USSR, could finally triumph in Namibia.

As he accepted the message of the president of the USSR, Mikhail Gorbachev, the president of Namibia, Sam Nujoma, pledged that his country would never forget the material, political, and diplomatic support that the USSR extended to Namibian people during the long years of its struggle for independence.

March 21, the day Soviet-Namibian diplomatic relations were established, marked the new stage in the history of relations between our two (?sovereign) countries. Those relations will now be facilitated, although we admit our country must learn to collaborate along new lines and to (?orient) such collaboration to mutual profit. Our cooperation must be productive for other reasons too.

During the period of Namibian decolonization, USSR and the United States often took up different positions where Namibia was concerned, and so, Namibia all too often was (?substantial) to the plans of global confrontation between the superpowers. As subsequent developments demonstrated, Soviet-American cooperation can do very much for the south of Africa and the entire continent for that matter.

As Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze stressed many times at the celebrations in Namibia, the solution of the Namibian problem opens up good prospects for a settlement of the domestic conflict in Angola through national reconciliation. The appearance of independent Namibia, next door to Angola, will undoubtedly promote this.

The Namibian factor is also influencing Mozambique, where events have shown the leadership also subscribes to a peace settlement.

But, perhaps the most exciting development of all is the prospect of the dismantling of the system of apartheid in South Africa. We would like to believe that a country that has made the difficult decision of shedding its status of colonial ruler will revise its attitudes to its own problems.

As to the Soviet Union, it is prepared, just as in the case with Namibia, to extend its services in promoting a peaceful settlement.

Solton Commentary Examines Namibian Independence

MB2203112090 Moscow in English to Southern Africa 1900 GMT 21 Mar 90

[Commentary by Yuriy Solton—read by announcer]

[Text] The start of freedom (?arose) for one and one-half million of Namibians on the 21st. At midnight, or to be more precise, on the 18th minute of the new day, the South African tricolor flag began to slide down from the flag post at the stadium in Windhoek, with South Africa giving up its 75 years of rule of Namibia as a colony.

Instead of the tricolor, to the jubilant chants of the multi-thousand crowd, the flag of independent Namibia went up in the presence of the UN Secretary General and officials from more than 100 countries, including the Soviet Union. The last colony in the African continent ceased to exist.

The Namibian people's path to freedom has been long and hard. The struggle was headed for years by the South-West African People's Organization, SWAPO, led by Sam Nujoma, who has become the first president of the new state.

The colonial authorities of South Africa resisted fiercely. However, they were able only to delay the course of history, not to stop it.

The entire world community was involved in Namibia gaining independence. An active role was played by the UN and the Frontline African states. An effect was also made by the positive changes in the world by the gradual departure from confrontation which we saw during talks on Namibia's future, observers from the Soviet Union and the United States at one and the same table. [sentence as heard]

A tribute should also be paid to the leadership of South Africa for its sensible approach. The example of Namibia has shown once again that local conflicts, complex, as they might be, can be settled politically.

The gaining of independence by Namibia has changed the situation in southern Africa. Therefore, it would be wrong to assume that everything will proceed without problems.

Disturbing conflict situations persist in Angola and Mozambique.

It is not known if South Africa will act further toward the frontline states and how far its government will go on the path of dismantling apartheid or [word indistinct] for the complex situation in southern Africa.

A few problems have to be tackled by Namibians too. These are economic, social and political problems.

The UN Secretary General Perez de Cuellar, has announced his intention to call an international conference for collecting aid for independent Namibia. Without doubt the Soviet Union which (?always) supported the liberation movement of the Namibians will be actively involved in this noble course.

In the midst of the [word indistinct] with President Sam Nujoma of Namibia, the Soviet president, Mikhail Gorbachev, has declared recognition of the Republic of Namibia as a sovereign state. He declared its readiness to establish diplomatic relations with it.

Thirty years ago on the initiative of the Soviet Union, the UN General Assembly adopted a declaration to grant independence to the colonial countries and peoples. The declaration underlined the need for the immediate and unconditional end to colonialism in all its forms and [word indistinct] now 30 years later the last colony in Africa has disappeared.

Namibian Minister Queried on Reconciliation

LD2303134290 Moscow TASS in English 1311 GMT 23 Mar 90

[Text] Windhoek March 23 TASS—By TASS special correspondents Aleksandr Prosvetov and Vitaliy Chukseyev:

The Namibian Government will pursue the policy of peace and stability, Information and Telecommunications Minister Hidipo Hamutenya said in an interview with TASS.

Many people were killed, wounded or left homeless, thousands were forced to fight their own people who were serving in the South African occupation army, and tens of thousands had to flee the country, Hamutenya said.

"After the adoption of United Nations Security Council Resolution 435 and elections to the National Assembly, we embarked on the policy of national reconciliation," he said.

"Representatives of the seven parties in the National Assembly have drafted the country's constitution. Alongside members of the South West Africa People's Organisation, there are representatives of other parties in the government. There are both black and white Namibians in the government."

"Today we are working together, after fighting each other for many years."

"We hope that the multi-party system will develop in an atmosphere of peace, stability, mutual respect and tolerance," the minister said.

The opposition has the right to work openly and express its views freely. However, its criticism should not be destructive. The government counts on the opposition's support, he said.

The government will work to upgrade Namibian telecommunications services and battle illiteracy, Hamutenya said.

"We plan to extend a telecommunications network throughout the country. I am optimistic about the future. Namibia has enough resources and hard-working people. However, in the scientific and technical sphere we will need foreign help, including Soviet help," he said.

Radio on Stronger Ties Between USSR, Tanzania

EA2603090590 Moscow International Service in Swahili 1730 GMT 24 Mar 90

[From "The Day's Important Events" program]

[Text] The Soviet foreign minister, Eduard Shevardnadze, continues his tour of African countries. He arrived in Tanzania on 24 March. Our correspondent, Mrs. (Yelena Vorniza) writes the following on the subject.

Relations between the USSR and Tanzania were established in 1961 [as heard]. Since then, they have been strengthened even further, but one may ask: How much has been achieved as a result of such relations?

So far, trade between Tanzania and the USSR stands at only two percent. Through Soviet assistance, two state farms were opened, and these are not properly developed. The USSR is also building a hospital, the construction of which began five years ago, and up to now the project is still incomplete.

However, there are still a number of fields through which the two countries can enhance relations for the common benefit of the two countries. Tanzania is in need of technical assistance for the development of its various economic sectors, which can be assisted by the USSR. The USSR would require tea, coffee, fruit, vegetables, [word indistinct] and fish from Tanzania. Nowadays, the USSR as well as Tanzania are seeking new methods of economic cooperation.

In an interview in Windhoek Eduard Shevardnadze stressed that when talking about Soviet policy concerning this region it is a must that we should learn from the past so that it can serve as a basis for new cooperation. The Soviet minister was first and foremost referring to the southern African region, especially the USSR's relations with Tanzania.

In February 1989 a transport company known as (Tan) Motor Trucking Limited was established. In February 1990 a nongovernmental agreement in the field of fisheries was signed to allow fishing in Tanzania's waters. In March this year, a protocol agreement was signed aimed at starting a transport project to be known as (Tansa).

Now it is clear that cooperation in the field of transport is very good. Some Soviet agricultural experts from (Soetnovs) are preparing to go to Tanzania to discuss the possibility of tea plantation on a cooperation basis. There is no doubt that such efforts will generate good results for both sides. The Soviet experts intend to employ Tanzanians whose role is clearly described by the Tanzanian ambassador to the USSR, Mr. (William Maluka Sambagua), who said:

[Begin recording] [Sambagua] Thete are good hopes for the cooperation plan on a joint project between the USSR and Tanzania. The USSR is a developed country which has many industries and goods for export. Tanzania, as a developing country, also has goods for export. The products being produced in the two countries are required by both sides. As a result of the newly introduced policy of perestroika in the USSR, which allows the people to establish joint companies, there is a good chance of strengthened cooperation for the benefit of the two sides. [end recording]

It is true that the advantage will be great, because a similar project has already produced good results. For instance, the first USSR-Tanzania joint project [words indistinct] has produced within two months $93,000 and 6.5 million shillings. This is only one part of the activities of the company. Its future production is estimated by the company's manager, (Moia Askanji), to be much higher, and according to him, this will depend on relations between partners, Soviets and Tanzanians, and he says:

[Begin Askanji recording] The Soviets are here with us. They are doing the work as their own, and they do not think about time at all. Sometimes they forget about going home because they have not yet finished their work. Therefore, we do not have a problem. When they arrived from the USSR I personally thought that since they were coming from another country perhaps they would not know how to do this kind of work, but they surprised me. They worked as though they had been in Tanzania for the last 10 years. Therefore, we do not have any problem with them. They are working just like any other Tanzanians who are recruited locally, so there is no problem. [end recording]

Friendly relations between the USSR and Tanzania are being strengthened not only through the development of new kinds of economic cooperation, but also through exchange visits at the governmental and mass organization level between the two states.

A while ago, some Soviet parliamentarians visited Tanzania. As usual, young boys and girls continue to arrive in the USSR from Tanzania for studies. For instance, in 1990 we have received 65 such people so far, and preparations for an exhibition by Soviet artists in Tanzania are really being strengthened and the current visit by the Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze to Tanzania is yet more clear evidence of that.

East Europe

Modrow Interviewed on PDS Election Results

PM2603092090 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report on interview with Hans Modrow, Party of Democratic Socialism election candidate, by TASS special correspondents Vyacheslav Kevorkov and Aleksey Korinenko in Berlin; date of interview not stated; first three paragraphs are TASS introduction: "Interview With H. Modrow"]

[Text] Berlin, 21 Mar—The unconditional winner in the elections to the GDR Volkskammer, along with the Alliance for Germany bloc of conservative parties, is unanimously reckoned to be the Party of Democratic Socialism [PDS], whose representatives will constitute a strong opposition in the country's future parliament, with 65 out of the 400 seats.

The PDS found itself in more difficult conditions than the other participants in the elections. The party had to rely exclusively on its own forces, operate without the support of coalition partners, and withstand all the opposition's efforts to separate the main PDS candidate

Hans Modrow from the rest of the party. More than once the statement "Modrow is a strong leader, but not for this party" was heard on the lips of politicians.

TASS special correspondents Vyacheslav Kevorkov and Aleksey Korinenko asked Modrow some questions directly after the publication of the preliminary results of the voting.

[Kevorkov, Korinenko] For all politicians, elections are a serious test, an opportunity to check their ability to predict the future. You are well known as as an experienced and honest analyst. How far does your prediction accord with the declared election results?

[Modrow] My prediction, like, obviously, the forecasts of any other politician, were complicated by a whole series of obscure factors. The voters' decisions difficult to predict owing primarily to two circumstances.

First, these were the first free elections in the GDR, and for that reason there were no opportunities for comparison. Second, emotional factors played a significant role, which is rather difficult to foresee. I reckoned that the PDS would get about 12 percent of the votes. Therefore I regard the 17.6 percent recorded by the party as more than satisfactory.

[Kevorkov, Korinenko] So your party has gone into opposition. Many politicians reckon that being in opposition can even be to some degree a more favorable situation than being in power: With less responsibility, there is more freedom to speak out. How do you plan to make use of the situation that has arisen?

[Modrow] I consider that the opposition should conduct itself very responsibly. This means above all constructiveness. For the time being, final ideas about the positions we will adopt in the Volkskammer do not exist. However, there are the election promises of the PDS, and we will try to fulfill them.

[Kevorkov, Korinenko] What awaits Germans in the future? Will the euphoria which has seized the people in both parts of Germany continue to hold sway? Has it not already brought about a certain sobering-up process in one part? And will not this sobering-up process spread to the other part as well? Would it be unjust to state in this respect that the migration of Germans to the FRG will take on even wider dimensions, and cause difficulties in both Germanys?

[Modrow] If euphoria over unification did exist, it is now giving way, at least for many GDR citizens, to sober reflections. In any case, a growing number of people are coming to the conclusion that before the unification of the GDR and the FRG takes place, it is necessary to think over and settle a lot of things, so that the people of the GDR do not lose out. Many who, back at the beginning of this year, were demanding immediate unification and even the annexation of the GDR to the FRG, today advocate that this process take place in a considered, gradual way, and that the interests of European states be taken into consideration.

I will not deny that among broad strata of the GDR population there is an opinion that introducing the West German mark into circulation would quickly help to improve their lives, without any great problems. This conviction, which I consider too optimistic, was evidently to a significant degree what shaped the voters' position.

Indeed, it is urgently necessary to show concern for people's social protection. If we do not succeed in doing this, or if the living standard in the GDR is significantly lower than the FRG indicators for a long time, then the exodus will not decline.

PDS Chairman Gregory Gysi Grants Interview

PM2603115190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 25 Mar 90 Second Edition p 5

[Interview with G. Gysi, chairman of the Party of Democratic Socialism, by APN correspondent V. Markov in Berlin; date of interview not stated; first paragraph is SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA introduction: "View from Opposition Chair; Gregory Gysi on PDS' Tasks Under New Conditions"]

[Text] Berlin—At SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA's request an APN correspondent met in Berlin with Gregory Gysi, chairman of the Party of Democratic Socialism [PDS], and asked him to comment on the results of the recent parliamentary elections and also to describe the tasks of the PDS as a parliamentary opposition party.

The defeat of the leftists at the elections, G. Gysi said, is largely explained by the fact that soon after the events of October last year the FRG government parties began to display an "occupation policy" with regard to the GDR. To a considerable extent they have succeeded in this. They tried to turn the elections into our country into "elections in favor of the FRG mark." That also worked.

All this has intensified the feelings of uncertainty among the GDR population and the desire to change the situation in the country as rapidly as possible. Unfortunately, nearly half the electorate believes that this can only be done by the CDU [Christian Democratic Union] which is in practice maintained by Helmut Kohl's Bonn party and which can more than others count on financial and other aid from the FRG Government.

[Markov] What, in addition to your party's grave legacy, are the reasons why it was able to achieve only third place in terms of the number of votes cast for it, although it remains the GDR's largest political party in terms of numerical strength?

[Gysi] Unfortunately, in the brief period which the PDS had before the elections we were unable to show sufficiently persuasively that the party has been renewed and that there is a sensible socialist alternative to the compromised Stalinist system. We had to resolve two complex tasks simultaneously—renewing the party and conducting the election struggle. Nonetheless in such a brief period the PDS was able to achieve quite a good result: Over 1.8 million people voted for it.

But those who have remained in the PDS have a completely different potential. PDS voters are also a completely new force: Two-thirds of them were previously dissociated from the SED [Socialist Unity Party of Germany].

[Markov] There is no doubt that voters gave their preference to the conservative parties because they promised the speediest union with the FRG. What is the PDS' position on questions of German unity?

[Gysi] We will display vigilance to ensure that the unification process in both German states proceeds as calmly as possible and is under control. The new Germany must not become a kind of second, larger, FRG and alongside a powerful economy lay claim to military hegemony. We cannot allow the process of unification, if it proceeds hastily and rashly, to jeopardize stability in Europe.

[Markov] What will be the priorities of the PDS, which already acts in the role of the parliamentary opposition? After all, it will have 66 of the 400 seats in the new GDR Volkskammer.

[Gysi] There is, first, the elaboration of draft laws which would enshrine the social rights of GDR citizens. Second, opposing attempts to subordinate the GDR to Bonn's interests. We are convinced that the attempt to join the GDR to the FRG on the basis of article 23 of West Germany's fundamental law, on which the conservative parties and the Bonn government are insisting, is not a "purely German-German" question but affects a whole series of problems of an international law nature. if the GDR social democrats continue to reject the extension of article 23 of the FRG fundamental law to our country, the conservatives will be unable to collect two-thirds of the votes of Volkskammer deputies to change the GDR constitution.

[Markov] What importance do you attach to cooperation with all democratic left-wing groupings in the GDR and FRG under the new conditions?

[Gysi] Without such collaboration and joint actions we will be unable to achieve our goals. All left-wing forces acting within the framework of a rule-of-law state have much in common in their programs: opposition to the inclusion of a future united Germany in NATO, the creation of guarantees of the inviolability of Poland's present borders, priority for the ecology, the protection of the population's social interests.

We will work to preserve and expand democratic structures in the GDR and to ensure that in the process of union with the FRG we do not lose everything positive achieved in the GDR in four decades.

GDR's De Maiziere Queried on Unification

LD2203104290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1530 GMT 21 Mar 90

[Text] Berlin, 21 March (TASS)—TASS correspondents Konstantin Savvin and Vadim Chudov report: The presence of NATO troops on the territory of the GDR is not possible. It is necessary to achieve a position whereby the political significance of the two military alliances predominates over their military significance, in close combination with the Vienna talks on disarmament and the CSCE process. Great opportunities are being opened up by the talks under the two-plus-four formula. This was stated in a conversation with the TASS correspondents by Lothar de Maiziere, chairman of the GDR Christian Democratic Union [CDU].

At the same time he confirmed his position that it is possible for the GDR to become part of the FRG under article 23 of the FRG Constitution. However, L. de Maiziere said, I do not consider that the constitutional question has the importance which it is now being given in discussions. What are most important are the fundamental conditions under which the unification will take place. They must be discussed, and accords must be reached on them.

Replying to a question about what the policy of the new GDR government with regard to the USSR should be, L. de Maiziere expressed confidence that the government to be set up should consistently follow the policy of its predecessor. Between the GDR and the USSR there exist special treaty relations in which corrections can be made if both sides wish. In the economic sphere the GDR has been cooperating with the USSR for decades. The republic's exports and imports have been formed by tradition and this to a large extent is connected with the raw material situation in the GDR. The leader of the CDU expressed himself in favour of economic relations between the GDR and the USSR acquiring a new quality. They will develop not exclusively in the form of state trade but in the form of trade between firms of the two countries. Such a step is part of the measures to form a market economy. As far as exports are concerned, L. de Maiziere continued, the Western European markets are saturated. There is little place for the GDR economy there. Therefore, we should develop our traditional economic links with the USSR.

Among the primary tasks of the new government of the GDR, L. de Maiziere mentioned the speeding up of talks to conclude monetary, economic, and social union with the FRG.

Replying to a question about the significance of the planned introduction of the land structure in the GDR, the chairman of the CDU noted that this idea in the first place was linked with the historical and cultural traditions in Germany. And second, one of the principles of democracy lies not in centralization but in decentralization.

Post-Election Questions Remain on Unification

PM2303154190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent V. Lapskiy dispatch under the rubric "Panorama of International Events": "More Questions Than Answers"]

[Text] Berlin—"Union and Alliance Forming GDR Government at Same Table in Bonn" is the headline of a NEUES DEUTSCHLAND report from the FRG capital, where three leaders of the conservative "Alliance for Germany," De Maiziere, Ebeling, and Eppelmann, have arrived from East Berlin for talks with Chancellor H. Kohl and the Christian Democratic Union [CDU].

Indeed, you get the impression that the new GDR Government will be formed in Bonn. It is reported that after the current talks, Volker Ruehe, general secretary of the CDU (FRG), said that the aim of his party is to create a broadly based government in the GDR. The CDU hopes that Lothar de Maiziere, chairman of the "Eastern" CDU, will be the prime minister of this government.

The first session of the Social Democratic faction in the Volkskammer has been held in Berlin. Ibrahim Boehme, was elected its chairman. The SPD [Social Democratic Party] board and party council recommended that the party "act constructively in opposition." However, local observers do not totally rule out the possibility of the Social Democrats entering the coalition government which is to be formed. The GDR Constitution can only be changed through the votes of a broad coalition that includes the Social Democrats.

The main question that interests the GDR is how a government led by the Christian Democrats will set about the unification of Germany. Not long before the elections, the local CDU defined its view of the process of German unification in the party newspaper NEUE ZEIT.

The unification of the two German states, the document says, represents both a political and economic and a moral and psychological process which will take a specific period of time, although certain steps such as the creation of a temporary social union are urgent. Even after political unification, it will take a long time to agree all the questions. Furthermore, German unification is part of the process of European rapprochement and it must be correlated with it.

The process of unification must not cause unease among Germany's neighbors or violate the existing military balance in central Europe. This means that the changes in Germany must take place by agreement with its neighbors. Unification must only take place within the framework of the current existing borders. Our borders with our neighbors are immutable. We expect that after 18 March both freely elected German parliaments will make a relevant statement, the document says.

From a legal viewpoint, many paths can lead to German unification. Article 23 of the FRG fundamental law makes it possible to reach it by the quickest route. However, the GDR will be able to embark on this path only if the conditions and framework for the fusion of the German states are clear and defined in advance. The CDU rejects the unconditional unification of the GDR with the FRG.

As we can see, the document contains many constructive ideas which are in keeping with the mood and the interests not only of the Germans but also the Europeans, and Germany's neighbors in particular.

Meanwhile, details have become known here about a session of the Bonn government at which decisions relating to the two German states were taken. First, it has been decided to establish a monetary union with the GDR before the end of April. In this context measures to forestall currency speculation have been discussed. Second, the Kohl government has decided to abolish all privileges granted to settlers from the GDR as from 1 July. They will lose financial aid and much else besides. Incidentally, the influx of settlers has almost halved in recent days.

Bonn's decision to accelerate the establishment of a monetary union has evoked an ambivalent reaction in the GDR. Many people believe that undue haste in this matter may damage the cause of unification—a mass of specific practical questions must be resolved first. They are asking: Does Bonn really take account of the material interests of millions of GDR citizens in its unification policy? The newspaper BERLINER ZEITUNG writes that the "great hopes of receiving a big check from the sponsor Kohl the day after the elections have burst like a soapbubble."

So far there are more questions than answers.

Accord Signed for Servicemen's Families in GDR

PM2303100190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Mar 90 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Agreement Signed"]

[Text] An agreement between the USSR and GDR Governments on job placement on GDR territory for family members of servicemen in the Soviet forces temporarily stationed on GDR territory was signed 16 March.

The job placement of Soviet citizens will be undertaken on the basis of current GDR labor and social legislation. Enterprises and Soviet citizens can conclude labor contracts and temporary work agreements in accordance with GDR legislation. The prior consent of the Soviet forces command is necessary before a labor contract is concluded.

A labor contract with Soviet citizens is likewise dissolved in accordance with GDR labor legislation or on application by the Soviet forces command. The time worked by Soviet citizens at enterprises counts toward the length of service needed to qualify for pensions and benefits in the USSR, under a procedure envisaged by current USSR legislation.

The statute on job placement and the provision of social guarantees for Soviet citizens on GDR territory emphasizes that Soviet citizens are equal members of production collectives. Their income is liable to income tax and to social insurance deductions according to GDR legislation.

Soviet citizens receive money benefits from GDR social insurance, payment of which ceases on termination of labor activity in the country.

At the same time, labor activity on GDR territory does not entitle Soviet citizens to receive the one-shot state maternity grant, the monthly child allowance, or paid release [osvobozhdeniye] from work at the expiry of maternity leave.

Compensation to Soviet citizens for industrial accidents or occupational illness is paid by a one-shot grant if full compensation has not been paid before the labor contract is dissolved.

The agreement on job placement on GDR territory for family members of servicemen in the Soviet forces temporarily stationed on GDR territory was signed by the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems and the GDR Ministry of Labor and Wages.

The agreement will help to further deepen friendship and mutual assistance between our peoples and will serve to expand cooperation between the USSR and the GDR.

GDR's Modrow Sends Congratulations to Gorbachev

PM2303142790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
18 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Undated message of congratulations from H. Modrow, chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers, to M.S. Gorbachev on his election as USSR president]

[Text] To President of the USSR Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev

Dear Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev!

On the occasion of your election as president of the USSR accept my most cordial congratulations.

Allow me to express the conviction that close bilateral relations imbued with trust will develop successfully in the future for the good of the people living in both our countries, and in the interests of ensuring peace, stability, and fruitful coexistence in Europe.

I take this opportunity to sincerely thank you for your great personal interest in our country's affairs, in supporting and developing multifaceted cooperation between the GDR and the USSR.

Allow me to wish you success in this lofty post in resolving the large-scale tasks facing the Soviet Union, and also health and prosperity.

[Signed] Hans Modrow, chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers.

PRAVDA Views 'Crisis' in Yugoslav Party

PM2603120190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
25 Mar 90 Second Edition p 7

[Own correspondent Ye. Fadeyev dispatch under the rubric "From Scene of Events": "Is Light Visible at End of Tunnel? Crisis in LCY"]

[Text] Belgrade—I will begin with two facts from the past week which, at first sight, are unconnected. The LCY [League of Communists of Yugoslavia] Central Committee Presidium examined suggestions and comments on its conclusions and assessments concerning the 14th (Extraordinary) LCY Congress, which dramatically suspended its sessions.

The other item of news: S. Darmanovic, member of the League of Communists of Montenegro Central Committee Presidium, left the League of Communists because, in his opinion, protection of the right to different views has not been ensured in the party. I could go on citing similar facts attesting that the LCY is going through a crisis.

Many people here are asking this question: What will happen to the LCY, and is there any light at the end of the tunnel today?

The replies are ambivalent. For the Communists of Slovenia the question has been decided: The party organization has been renamed the League of Communists of Slovenia-Party of Democratic Renewal, with its own statutes and program. To this it should be added that the republic recently removed the word "socialist" from its name. The first elections in the country in which Communists will voluntarily compete for power with other, alternative movements begin there early in April.

A similar situation has taken shape in Croatia. That republic's party leadership has officially announced that it will not participate in the work of the LCY's highest organ—the Presidium. And the party organization now has a new name: the League of Communists of Croatia-Party of Democratic Transformations...

Complex processes are also occurring these days in other republic and provincial party organizations. There is a clash between two concepts of the further development of the LCY and the federative community as a whole. And yet almost everyone agrees on one thing: The LCY can no longer be what it has been in recent years—a monolithic, monopoly party. "Maybe it was even necessary," TANJUG comments, "to work toward a split in order to clear up different opinions and to enable political forces to try to resolve contradictions by means of reorganization... The existence of several Communist organizations in Yugoslavia and, maybe, even of socialist or social democratic ones arising out of the LCY must not a priori be considered something negative if they ensure our society's left-wing orientation. Incidentally, this can also be viewed as a legalization of the delimitation that already exists within the 'unified' League of Communists..."

It is no coincidence that these days many mass media in Yugoslavia are calling Ante Markovic, head of the Federal Executive Council, the individual who unites the country. The program that he proposes is neither Croatian (Markovic is a Croat by nationality), nor Serbian, nor Slovenian. It is unanimously considered Yugoslav—a fact confirmed yesterday in Zagreb, where the head of government declared at a meeting with the republic's leading economic planners that attempts to spoke the wheels of economic reform have no future.

Slovene Opposition to Yugoslav Federation Noted

PM2203155790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Ye. Vostrukhov dispatch: "Yugoslavia: Slovenia Issues Ultimatum"]

[Text] Belgrade—IZVESTIYA has already reported that relations between the Slovenian Republic and the Yugoslav federation have recently deteriorated sharply once again. The fears expressed by the country's public for the fate of the multiethnic state have brought about new amendments to the Slovenian Constitution, adopted by its Republic Assembly (parliament), and also other decisions by Slovenian deputies limiting the operation of federal laws on the territory of one of the six federal republics. Many people in the SFRY consider the change in the name of this northern republic to be unconstitutional (Republic Assembly deputies resolved to remove the word "socialist" from its title).

Meanwhile debates on an "independent," "autonomous" republic "without ideological definitions in its title" have shifted from the Republic Assembly hall to the squares of cities and villages and even to the border. During the election campaign, forceful party and national leaders used any excuse to demonstrate their personal boldness and resourcefulness to the voters in upholding "national independence" in order to publicly attack "central" decisions.

It is well known that all Yugoslavia supports the federal government's steps to combat inflation and implement radical economic reform. But Ante Markovic's cabinet is very much hampered by the outmoded Constitution. All the republics have approved the government's proposed constitutional amendments. All except Slovenia—more accurately, its Republic Assembly. It now disagrees with the government resolution changing the regime for guarding the state border. The republic was visited by the federal secretary for internal affairs. All "border" questions seemed to have been removed. Suddenly the Slovenes issued a new ultimatum: If the border zone in the heart of their territory was not reduced to the previous 100 meters, the republic's assembly would suspend the federal resolution's operation and the republic would at the same time recall its plenipotentiaries from all federal bodies. Well, the many months of attacks on the federation from some Slovenes and the mass media have now borne fruit. The latest public opinion poll in this republic showed that more and more of its citizens see Slovenia's future as being within a confederative Yugoslavia. Some 51.9 percent of those polled favor a change in the status of the single, multiethnic power and its transformation into a confederative alliance of "independent Balkan states," while almost one-third want to leave the SFRY, and only 7.9 percent are in favor of an "effective, transformed federation."

The Slovenian press is discussing in a businesslike manner the problems involved in switching to "full state independence," their own national foreign policy, and the formation of Slovenian embassies in neighboring countries, including Serbia's capital, Belgrade. The association of so-called Slovenian oppositionists—"Demos"—for instance, advocates the "dismissal" of the Yugoslav federation. Its position is close to the "reformist" program of the Slovenian Democratic Alliance—one of the new parties fighting for power and seats in parliament.

Yugoslav Leader Greets Gorbachev on Election

PM2303105190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Undated message of congratulations from J. Drnovsek, chairman of the SFRY Presidium, to M.S. Gorbachev on his election as president of the USSR]

[Text] To President of the USSR Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev

Esteemed Comrade President,

On the occasion of your election as the first president of the USSR I send you, on behalf of the SFRY Presidium and from myself, the most cordial greetings and best wishes for your responsible activity.

We are sure that in this exceptionally important post you will continue to successfully carry out the policy of democratizing Soviet society and contributing to the development of equal international relations in the interests of cooperation, peace and security throughout the world.

On this occasion I would like once more to stress Yugoslavia's willingness to continue to deepen and improve friendly relations and comprehensive cooperation with the Soviet Union, to whose development you have made a major contribution.

[Signed] Janez Drnovsek, chairman of the SFRY Presidium.

Yugoslav Dissident on Yugoslavia, East Europe

PM2103184290 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 10, 6-12 Mar 90 pp 16-17

[Interview with Yugoslav dissident Milovan Djilas by APN correspondents Andrey Vinogradov and Aleksandr Slabynko; date, place not given; first paragraph is NEW TIMES introduction: "The Bitter Fruit of the Revolution"]

[Text] Milovan Djilas is often referred to as the most titled dissident in postwar Yugoslavia. Some pronounce this name with admiration, others with open hostility. Some identify Josip Broz Tito's long-time and close associate with the policy of "red" terror. Others rank him among the initiators of the current democratization process. In a word, each picks up his half of that outstanding man's 78-year-long life because it is difficult to reconcile these halves within the framework of ones destiny, even though that of a politician. One finds it hard to agree with all he says, although much of what he has uttered and written makes a lot of sense. However, should not we be well-advised to agree with those who, whether they accept your opinion or not, say, following a Christian custom: "May God judge him..." They are, probably, the closest to the truth, because "mundane" authorities have already judged him on more than one occasion.

[NEW TIMES] Mr Djilas, what are the reasons for your break with the party and the party's break with you, which resulted in your imprisonment and decades of living like an emigre in your own country?

[Djilas] Already in the early postwar days I came to resent the Communists' obsession with luxuries beyond the ordinary people's reach: cars, villas, all sorts of privileges. At first I thought it was just a temporary weakness after wartime privations, mere trifles as compared with the great communist idea. Nevertheless, I decided to quit a political career and to go back to literature. Tito did not let me go. Then came the conflict with the Soviet Union—with Stalin, actually. At that juncture, critical for Yugoslavia, resignation would have amounted to the betrayal of the cause of the party. After Stalin's death, the rather modest process of liberalization, which had begun in Yugoslavia, came to an end. Such was Tito's will. A compromise with such a policy line would mean a deal with my conscience. My public statements brought excommunication from the party upon myself, and my sharp protest against Yugoslavia's official position as regards the Soviet intervention in Hungary landed me in jail for three years. While I was serving my sentence, the first edition of my book, "The New Class," came out, and in 1957 I was re-tried and sent back to jail, this time for nine years. Four years later I was released, only to be arrested again in a year and two months... The book "Conversations with Stalin" came out.

I had been a convinced communist, a religious one even, for years.

[NEW TIMES] But later your name came to be identified with anti-communism, didn't it?

[Djilas] I have never considered myself an anti-communist and even quip sometimes that nothing can be worse than communism, except anti-communism, orthodox anti-communism. Seriously speaking, I regard myself as a critic of communism. However, I do not believe that criticism of the founders of communism detracts from their enormous historic importance. It brings their teaching back down to earth...

[NEW TIMES] Where there is no room for socialism or for communism left, according to many politicians of today's Eastern Europe...

[Djilas] I also think it's time these ideas were given up, and see this as an inevitability. Lenin's ideas are suitable for certain countries at certain stages of their historical development. On the other hand, I do not share the current opinion that the revolutions in our countries have been mistakes—criminal mistakes even. This kind of talk is becoming fashionable now, you know... I am of the opinion that the revolutions have brought results, borne fruit. True, not quite the results we the leaders hoped for.

[NEW TIMES] Don't these results include the collapse of the ideology which you used to personify so rigidly and uncompromisingly in Yugoslavia?

[Djilas] Communist ideology is practically nonexistent today. But it did exist. The leading role of ideologies is characteristic of the Communist parties which are struggling for power. It would be stupid to deny its inspiring and uniting force. But later, after the victory, ideology becomes a means of keeping in power, and, as a result, becomes schematic and disintegrates.

[NEW TIMES] In a word, you forecast the disappearance of what has been named "real socialism" for years, is that right?

[Djilas] Total disappearance. The current developments in Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union are much like those in Hungary and Czechoslovakia. True, in our multinational states which, as we say, have gone through real revolutions, the pace of these developments is slower.

[NEW TIMES] You have used the expression "real revolutions"...

[Djilas] ...were revolutions which involved the armed seizure of power. In the course of revolutionary changes a rather strong ruling stratum took shape. It has its convictions and setbacks, its achievements, its history and its present day. You call it "nomenklatura," and I call it "the new class..." we have satisfied ourselves that they can offer strong resistance to the process now under way.

[NEW TIMES] By force?

[Djilas] I do hope there will be no civil wars, but violence may be, and is already, used in interethnic conflicts. The extraordinary situation in the autonomous region of Kosovo only goes to complicate the situation in Yugoslavia and deepen the crisis. Incidentally, this is being made use of by the current government of Albania under the pretext of promoting the national unification of its nation. So the problems of ethnic Albanians in Yugoslavia help strengthen the position of the authorities in Tirana on the one hand, and slow down the democratization process in our country on the other.

[NEW TIMES] Well, where is the way out?

[Djilas] The way out lies in the openness of the Albanian nation capable of bringing about the cultural and spiritual unification of the Albanians irrespective of where they live. So far, Yugoslavia, Serbia above all, are in no position even to begin settling the conflict. We also need broad and genuine democratization, which would stimulate democratic processes in the parts of Yugoslavia inhabited by ethnic Albanians as well. I do not believe that the Albanians' problems in Kosovo will be happily solved for as long as there exist conditions which incite chauvinist feelings. Besides, success in stamping out the hotbeds of interethnic tension largely depends on the overall democratic climate in Europe.

[NEW TIMES] Unfortunately, the processes in Eastern Europe often aggravate international relations so far. Are you optimistic about the outlook for a united Yugoslavia?

[Djilas] As an idea, Yugoslavia is long dead. Economic links between our republics and territories, and understanding between people of different religions exist thanks to the similarity of the languages we speak...To my mind, Yugoslavia means Serbo-Croatian relations. The state of affairs in Yugoslavia depends on the state of these relations. If nationalism prevails in these relations, Yugoslavia will fall apart, inevitably so, although I personally regard extremist, separatist nationalism as a temporary and anti- historic phenomenon.

[NEW TIMES] You foretell the loss of influence by the Communist parties of East European countries. What if some of them establishes a military regime? Can that happen in Yugoslavia?

[Djilas] Communist parties withdraw from the political scene in the West, as well as in the East. They have no future. Incidentally, about the East. A reversal in Yugoslavia or the Soviet Union—say, to military regimes—would only look communist. Military bureaucracy would take over from civil bureaucracy...This would inevitably lead to demonstrations, strikes and armed clashes. And now about the League of Communists of Yugoslavia. I make no exceptions for it. The League does not seem to be able to go further than fine-sounding and unnecessary resolutions. The split in the LCY is obvious. To my mind, the League consists of different parties which ought to try and form a coalition.

[NEW TIMES] That is, you don't think the restoration of the LCY's unity possible?

[Djilas] The possibility of this is an illusion. Different, rather than identical parties have emerged within the framework of the LCY. These are democratic and social democratic parties, possibly with ethnic or nationalist hues. In the long run, having transformed into political forces independent in every respect they may form coalitions with other parties. The processes now under way in our republics vary in magnitude, if I may say so. To my mind, Slovenia plays a revolutionary role in the struggle against the Titoist system. It's got more democracy, and the opposition there is legalized. In Croatia, a half of the opposition is legalized, I would say. In Serbia, this process has not started yet, but dissidents are already put up with. At any rate, my "The New Class" is to come in Belgrade this February, it seems.

[NEW TIMES] East European parties are just learning the art of working in a coalition. Imagine entirely different forces coming to the fore in each republic. What will keep Yugoslavia together in this case?

[Djilas] The economy, culture, the geopolitical situation-...Guarantees of self-determination right up to secession. A genuine democratic federation. Continued Titoism is the road to division. People do not like living under tight dictatorial regimes. They can put up with such regimes under definite circumstances, but only for the time being.

[NEW TIMES] How come you have arrived at this conclusion, despite the fact that you used to be a supporter and an active builder of precisely what you call a dictatorial regime?

[Djilas] Well, communism has meant freedom to me...Coming freedom, that is, of course.

I realize that what is happening in Europe today is a tragedy for veteran Communists above all. A terrible tragedy...on the other hand, what we have here is a normal post-revolutionary process.

[NEW TIMES] What course will it take in Eastern Europe, to your mind?

[Djilas] This is a universal process. The Eastern and Western parts of Europe are drawing closer together. This is true of the Soviet Union as well. Let me tell you that I reject outright the Western theory of granting economic aid to the U.S.S.R. only on condition it relinquishes any influence on Eastern Europe. I take the same view of the plans to create the so-called Middle

Europe, i.e. to turn Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and possibly, Yugoslavia into a "buffer" of sorts between the U.S.S.R. and the West (including the U.S.A.). These theories are typical of the policy of dividing spheres of influence. Being no idealist, I realize that elements of this policy will inevitably persist for as long as superpowers exist, although they are alien to the current development of Eastern Europe. The process of rapprochement should bring positive results. Theoretically, I do not rule out the possibility of our countries being even more democratic than the Western ones in the future. As I have already said, I regard the changes in Eastern Europe as a democratic revolution. So far, things are moving towards bourgeois liberalization. I think that it is simply impossible to reform, to improve the system which has taken shape by now. This is an illusion which can only slow down the course of events, rather than accelerate it.

Iliescu Statement on Transylvania Status Cited

PM2703112990 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 27 Mar 90 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "I. Iliescu Speech"]

[Text] The political and interethnic conflicts which have recently taken place in Romania create the illusion that the question of who Transylvania belongs to is a matter open to discussion.

We categorically maintain that Transylvania and the fact that it belongs to Romania cannot be the subject of discussions and talks—this is the common position of all the country's citizens, including representatives of the Hungarian nationalist minority, I. Iliescu, chairman of the Provisional Council for National Accord, stated on Romanian television Sunday.

Our state, he emphasized, will steadfastly defend and guarantee the development of true democracy and will act with all its energy against any attempts to destabilize Romania. In the light of the situation in the country and aiming to forestall the escalation of tension, I. Iliescu appealed to all political parties and unions and the church to call upon the country's citizens for calm and the maintenance of order, to refrain from violence, and to set about restoring the industrial and academic processes.

The Romanian leader also urged Hungarian officials to avoid political declarations which could provoke an undesirable reaction from citizens of Hungarian, as well as of Romanian, nationality. We have no other option but to live in peace, harmony, and good-neighborliness, he pointed out.

Romanian Situation 'Unclear' as Trials Begin

PM2303163590 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 23 Mar 90 p 3

[TASS correspondent D. Dyakov article written for KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA: "Romania: Riddles of the Revolution. They Remain Unsolved Three Months After the Events"]

[Excerpt] Bucharest—[passage omitted] Another riddle of the Romanian revolution concerns the terrorists. For many days on end, we journalists accredited in Romania did everything possible to arrange a meeting with at least one of them, either in jail or in a hospital where, as we were told, several dozen persons had been admitted. To no avail.

I first heard about terrorists at the television station on 22 December. Its corridors were packed by thousands of people at that momentous time in the country's history. Suddenly they all started running away in confusion. A rumor ran along the corridors: Large groups of terrorists were approaching the television station. "Ceausescu's people are real beasts," the young guy who had just inspected my documents stammered. "They are trained in special schools up in the mountains; they will stop at nothing to save their patron."

The whole world followed the development of events in Palace Square, where Securitate members loyal to the former regime launched a real war. Everyone saw the explosions, the exchanges of fire, and the bright tongues of flames in the windows of the Council of State building. The terrorists did not just fight against the Army, they kept the entire country in a state of tension by shooting at people in the streets from rooftops.

It was during those days in December that the Romanian press published photographs of weaponry discovered in the capital and other cities in the country, including two light tanks which were not part of the Romanian Army's armaments. Rumors were circulating about the exceptional cruelty and fierce resistance by supposed terrorists of Near East origin. Who were these people, how long had they been in Romania, and where did they get hold of the helicopters it was claimed they had used? How many terrorists were killed, how many were captured, where are the rest, and why have we not seen a single one of them face to face?—that was the question Romanian newspapers asked in the first few days of the new year.

The answer to many of these questions should have been provided by the emergency military tribunals, set up by a special decree on 7 January and meant to "hear on the spot" the cases of criminals charged with terrorism. But the leadership which came to power wished to avoid fresh bloodshed in the country. "Let the pair of dictators be the last people sentenced to death in Romania," the National Salvation Front address to the people said.

Several trials were held, but the situation remained unclear. Quite the opposite: People kept asking more and more questions. The main one was: Who was terrorizing the country even five and six days after the victory of the people's revolution? After all, everyone knew that the bulk of those who went on trial in Sibiu, Bucharest, and other cities had been arrested on 22 December. Moreover, those brought before military tribunals so far had been only senior officials from Securitate and the internal affairs organs who, as a rule, had not fired a single shot personally. They had been issuing orders which had come down from "the top."

We are not meant, ROMANIA LIBERA wrote, to be witnessing a "Romanian Nuremberg." How come that the "small fry" have disappeared without a trace, while charges against the "whales" do not extend beyond crimes committed between 16 and 22 December? The tens and hundreds of thousands of Romanians who perished in jails or while building sundry canals and other "construction projects of the century"—is that not genocide? How about the elderly who froze to death or died through the lack of medicines, the sick who paid for the dictatorship's crimes with their lives? How about the destruction of churches and the systematic persecution of the intelligentsia—is this not encompassed by the concept of "genocide"? It was obvious, the same newspaper wrote, that the military tribunal which tried Ceausescu's stooges constantly steered the trial along purely criminal tracks. And the court pretended not to have heard anything when I. Dinca, former deputy prime minister in the Ceausescu government, clearly wishing to indicate that he knew much more, suddenly started talking about a certain "Zee-Zee" ("End of the End") Plan in his final speech. Meanwhile many Romanian journalists had claimed that, according to this top secret plan, Romania and six Near East states were to help one another if acute situations developed. Light tanks, unfamiliar weapons, "dark-skinned" terrorists—was this all not an attempt to implement the secret plan? I. Dinca's rejoinder, heard on television all over the country, only excited people. As for the court, it ignored it.

Members of the military tribunal now sitting in Timisoara are not touching these problems, either. The Securitate officers in the dock are playing the part of innocents, even exchanging jokes during the trial, as if confident that the tribunal will not examine any more serious charges. It is no accident that almost all journalists reporting from the court room have remarked that "the accused know much more than they are telling, and they also have much more accurate information about the repressive apparatus than has recently been published."

Meanwhile the "main terrorists"—people who ran the operation to stifle the demonstrations in that city and were directly subordinate to the dictatorship—are absent from the dock in Timisoara. They are I. Coman, former secretary of the Romanian Communist Party Central Committee, and high-ranking officials I. Matei and R. Balan. Nor is anything being said about the role played by former Prime Minister C. Dascalescu, who visited Timisoara during the disturbances. "Can the tribunal establish the true guilt of the accused if those who gave the orders are absent from the courtroom?"—this is the question asked by the newspaper 22, organ of the group "For Social Dialogue."

The Romanian revolution brought to life not just progressive forces wishing to establish democracy and social justice in the country as soon as possible. There also appeared people who organized a proper "witch hunt." Slogans reading "Down with the Securitate" are displayed next to different ones, reading "Down with the Communists" at numerous rallies now being held in Romania, while the people's revolution is often described not only as anti-Ceausescu but also as anti-communist. Participants in a demonstration held in Timisoara 11 March and attended by some 15,000 persons demanded that the country's president should not be elected from among former party members, not even from among those who were "dissidents during the dictatorship period," and advocated that former Communists and Securitate members should be debarred from running for election to leadership positions for the next three terms.

As happens after every revolution, now it is not easy to determine who in Romania is determined to build a new life and stand up with his people, or how serious that determination is. It is already clear, however, that certain political forces, as the Romanian newspapers remark, are "trading in revolution." As for ordinary people observing these processes, they ask themselves with growing frequency: Who is actually right?

These questions will have to be answered sooner or later. So, would it not be better to answer them in good time?

TV, Radio Agreement Signed With Romania

LD2203111190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1438 GMT 21 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, 21 March (TASS)—The signing took place today in Moscow of a working protocol on cooperation in the field of television and radio broadcasting between the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting [Gosteleradio SSSR] and Free Romanian Radio and Television for 1990-1992.

The document provides for further development of cooperation, expansion of the exchange of television and radio material about life in the USSR and Romania, and promotion of exchanges of staff for the preparation of television and radio programs about important events in the lives of the peoples of both countries, and for mutual study of work experiences.

The document was signed by P.N. Reshetov, first deputy chairman of Gosteleradio SSSR, and R. Teodorescu, chairman of Free Romanian Radio and Television.

The signing was attended by V. Sandru, Romania's ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the USSR.

Bulgarian Communists To Vote on Party Name

LD2203122990 Moscow TASS in English 1203 GMT 22 Mar 90

[Text] Sofia March 22 TASS—By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Stepanenko:

A party referendum that began here on Wednesday will decide whether to preserve the name of the Bulgarian Communist Party or rename it the Bulgarian Socialist Party.

The discussion of this issue began at the 14th Extraordinary Party Congress, Member of the Presidium of the Supreme Party Council Filip Bokov told the RABOTNICHESKO DELO newspaper.

There were several proposals on the party's name, including the Party of Democratic Socialism and the Bulgarian Workers' Party.

"We think that the name 'Bulgarian Socialist Party' most of all corresponds to the documents adopted by the congress and the new character the party must assume in the upcoming period of fierce political struggle," said Bokov.

He admitted that the referendum bears a certain risk of a party split. However, the party leadership hopes that it will not happen, since "every party member understands the need for unity on the eve of elections and the importance of unification on the basis of the course towards changes in the Communist Party. One should be guided by reason rather than emotions when voting."

Before the referendum, the party's SOVREMENEN POKAZATEL journal polled members of the Sofia party organisation. Sixty-seven per cent of respondents favoured changing the name to the Bulgarian Socialist Party.

Referendum results will become known by next Wednesday.

Bulgaria's Lilov Stresses Avoidance of Violence

PM2603102990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Mar 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Referendum Will Decide"]

[Text] Sofia, 23 Mar—The most important word which our party is currently saying to the Bulgarian people is renewal. This was stated by A. Lilov, chairman of the BCP [Bulgarian Communist Party] Supreme Party Council, in a speech to a municipal party organization election rally in Varna.

Today we communists are struggling for radical and integrated renewal in our country, he said. This process was begun by the party without any outside pressure. The Extraordinary 14th BCP Congress was a continuation of the course of change.

A revolution without bloodshed or violence is the way chosen by our party in the struggle for the transition to a democratic system, the speaker pointed out. The Bulgarian revolution may not be "easy," but it should not be bloody either. Communists should struggle for a transition to democracy without social cataclysms, unrest, violence, or chaos.

The members of the BCP leadership took part in mass rallies and meetings in Khaskovo, Blagoevgrad, and Smolyan. The rallies expressed extensive support for the proposal to change the BCP's name to the Bulgarian Socialist Party. This matter should be settled during the partywide referendum which is currently being held.

'Retribution' Among East Europeans Viewed

90UI0433A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 13 Mar 90 p 3

[Article by Mikhail Botyan: "Out of Revenge?"]

[Text] A few days ago I read the report of the interrogation of E. Honecker. I reflected on it, then fell into a deep disarray of feelings. What had caused this? The reader should not think I am trying to vindicate the former GDR leader. As a political leader Honecker completely discredited himself and suffered severe punishment for it. His political career ended in shame. He was expelled from the party and lost everything, even his housing. And, finally, he came to trial. Both the foreign and our own mass media reported this literally with exultation. Admit it, dear reader, many of us were also thinking—it serves him right. Now it turns out many of the accusations which disconcerted us are, to put it mildly, doubtful. The 75 million marks he supposedly appropriated turns out to be a myth. He did not accumulate "mansions and palaces" for himself, and complications have arisen in the matter of "state treason." And so here the question arises: What are such terrible accusations based on? What was guiding those who advanced them? Is it not simply revenge against the leader of the GDR's former ruling party which is behind them?

Questions, questions... Many questions arise when you read the report carefully.

It is unclear, for example, who in Berlin gave the order to bring ordnance out onto the streets to suppress the demonstrations of 6-7 October. According to Honecker, Egon Krenz gave him assurances that the situation in the city was under control. However, receiving instructions to check the facts and report back to Honecker, Krenz failed to do this for some reason. What was guiding his behavior? Was it not the desire to ascend, riding the crest of an approaching quiet revolution? But in the final analysis, he himself became its political victim.

The main question is—are Honecker's accusers motivated just by a sense of justice? How else are we to look at the persistent interrogations of an old man on the brink of death? We have experienced something similar. The "white" terror, the "red" terror... What is next? Can this chain of vengeance be endless? But all this has taken place, and is taking place in the 20th century—when we see universal proclamations of humanism, good, and justice.

I understand the senselessness of executing the family of the tsar and was interested in familiarizing myself with sympathetic publications dealing with this. But look at how the Western—and not just Western—mass media display, seemingly with a sense of gratification, photos of Romania's executed dictator Ceausescu and his wife. It goes without saying—the torturers of their people received just punishment. But why make a spectacle out of vengeance?

Why today do we see in certain East European states—which proclaim humane, democratic socialism as their ends—entirely inhumane, entirely undemocratic means? There are suicides of communists in Czechoslovakia brought to a sense of despair, job dismissals in Poland based on former party membership. Not just the living, but the dead too are falling out of favor. Monuments to V.I. Lenin are being destroyed. Can this be considered humane? To pull from his pedestal the man who in 1918 affixed his signature to the decree on independence of Poland? And quite recently—a sad example from Romania. On a wave of hatred toward the prior regime headed by Ceausescu, who distorted the essence of Leninism through to its foundations, here too the monument to Ilyich was deemed undesirable.

Can we not trace in these acts of retribution something similar to the Russian revolt we are so familiar with from history, "senseless and merciless" in Pushkin's words? God willing, let it remain in history.

So where can we learn tolerance and restraint? From the church perhaps? After all, we know that the dethroned and hunted Honecker found refuge in the evangelical community, although he had in no way indulged the church with attention. A paradox? Or deep-seated wisdom? And genuine humanism?

West Europe

Reportage on Yazov's Visit to France

Visit Previewed

LD2703093290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0430 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] [Announcer] USSR Minister of Defense Comrade Yazov arrives in France on an official visit today. Oleg Maksimenko, our correspondent in France, reports:

[Oleg Maksimenko] France has not received such a high-level delegation from the Soviet military since 1972. As they say, this period of time speaks for itself. In the last 10 years ties between the two countries in this sphere have been virtually completely frozen. The resumption of contacts began in 1987. From that moment, exchanges along military lines have been constantly intensifying: In April last year, Jean-Pierre Chevenement, the French minister of defense [visited the USSR] and today Comrade Yazov is arriving on a return visit to France, accompanied by a large group of high-ranking Soviet military men.

This visit will last until 30 March and promises to be very useful. The Soviet minister of defense will be received in Paris by Prime Minister Michel Rocard. Comrade Yazov will then visit many important military installations. To be specific, he will visit the flagship of the French Navy, the aircraft carrier Clemenceau, based in Toulon. He will also visit a military air base in Reims and a number of other "sacred places" of the French Armed Forces. On the final day of his trip, Comrade Yazov will be received by French Minister of Defense Jean-Pierre Chevenement.

It is impossible to avoid seeing the visit by the Soviet military to France as a sign of the times. It is only thus, by consolidating knowledge about each other, including specifically in the military sphere, that it is possible to establish a climate of confidence and mutual understanding between countries.

Arrives in France

LD2703093890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0916 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] Paris, 27 Mar (TASS)—Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR minister of defence, arrived here today on an official visit. He was met at Paris Orly Airport by Jean-Pierre Chevenement, French minister of defense, and other officials. Ya.P. Ryabov, USSR ambassador in France, was among the welcoming party.

The USSR defense minister is making his visit at the invitation of the French defense minister within the context of expanding bilateral contacts in the military sphere. J.-P Chevenement has previously made a visit to the USSR.

It is envisaged that during his visit the Soviet defense minister will meet with French premier Michel Rocard, will conduct talks with J.-P. Chevenement, and will visit a number of French military installations and military training institutions.

Meets Rocard, Chevenement

LD2703131990 Moscow TASS in English 1247 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] Paris March 27 TASS—Visiting Soviet Defence Minister Army General Dmitriy Yazov was received by French Prime Minister Michel Rocard today.

Issues of mutual interest were discussed. The two sides expressed confidence that Soviet-French relations will successfully develop on the foundation that was laid during the summit meeting between President Gorbachev and President Francois Mitterand.

It was noted that the development of contacts in the military field, within the framework of the multifaceted Soviet-French relations, promotes the consolidation of confidence and mutual understanding between the USSR and France.

French Defence Minister Jean-Pierre Chevenement and Soviet Ambassador in France Ya. Ryabov joined the two statesmen in a warm and friendly talk.

The Soviet defence minister also talked with his French counterpart and met chief of staff of the French Armed Forces Army General Maurice Schmitt.

Gen Omelichev Concludes Visit to UK

LD2403234490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1327 GMT 23 Mar 90

[Text] London, 23 March (TASS)—Lieutenant General B.A. Omelichev, first deputy chief of general staff of the USSR Armed Forces, who is heading a Soviet military delegation, has visited a number of military facilities in Scotland. He spent some time in the British air force training centre at Rosyth Naval Base, on the missile destroyer "York," and also on a minesweeper on a sweeping exercise in the Forth Estuary.

British military circles see the Soviet delegation's visit as a new step in the establishment of contacts between the top military leadership in the two countries and in extending detente in East-West relations to the military sphere.

Later in the day Lt. Gen. Omelichev had a final meeting with General R. Vincent, Great Britain's first deputy chief of defence staff.

The soviet military delegation has left for home.

'Terrorists' Damage Embassy Cars in Athens

LD2703101990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] The roar of explosions woke the inhabitants of several districts of the Greek capital last night. Twelve cars of foreign embassies and missions were blown up in a number of districts of the city, including two cars with license plates of the USSR Embassy. There were no casualties in the explosions.. It is thought that terrorists threw TNT blasting cartridges with Bickford fuses into the cars. The police are investigating.

Bessmertnykh Receives Turkish Ambassador 14 Mar

PM2103144390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Mar 90 Moscow Evening Edition p 8

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Announcements"]

[Text] A.A. Bessmertnykh, USSR first deputy foreign minister, received V. Vural, Turkish ambassador to the USSR, 14 March at the latter's request.

Shipping Agreement Signed With Turkey

LD2503043690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1832 GMT 23 Mar 90

[Text] Istanbul, 23 Mar (TASS)—Today, the seven-day working visit to Turkey by Yu.M. Volmer, USSR minister of the maritime fleet, who was here at the invitation of Cengiz Tuncer, Turkey's minister of transportation, ended. A bilateral agreement on shipping was signed, and numerous meetings and conversations with Turkish partners took place. The guests visited shipbuilding and ship repair enterprises.

This is the first visit to Turkey by a USSR minister of the maritime fleet in the history of Soviet-Turkish relations.

IZVESTIYA Dismisses Gordiyevskiy Revelations

PM2603131390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Dispatch by IZVESTIYA correspondent A. Krivopalov: "Farcical Masquerade"]

[Text] London—In the land of Shakespeare, top-class theater is still as popular as ever. But there was recently a television performance here which, I am sure, would not have elicited applause in most English households. Admittedly, its producers were not professional thespians, rather they are the masters of backstage operations.

I am talking about the appearance on "Panorama" of one Oleg Gordiyevskiy—an appearance that was clearly organized by the British secret services. He is their agent—one of long standing. While working in the Soviet Embassy in Denmark about 15 years ago, he was recruited by MI-6—the United Kingdom's counterintelligence service. For a decade he meticulously supplied his masters with information until he eventaully defected in 1985.

Since then he has not put in an appearance in public. In some cozy corner he was "milked" for everything that could be of the slightest interest. Naturally, he was mainly exploited for propaganda purposes. Thus, immediately after Gordiyevskiy's flight (British newspapers wrote that he was taken out of Moscow with the help of British official representatives in the secret compartment of a truck), 31 Soviet citizens were deported from London on no specific charge, accused of activity incompatible with their official status.

Years have passed and now we have Gordiyevskiy appearing on British television... London's THE INDEPENDENT described the "debut" by the main hero of the show in an ironic manner. It pointed out the fact that it was stage-managed to a significant extent by the secret services. He looked strange on the screen. He was kitted out with props—a wig and a false beard.

The most ridiculous thing about the farcical masquerade which the special producers put on for the British audience and also about Gordiyevskiy's articles, in which he almost acted as an ideological crusader, were his claims. This MI-6 agent claimed that the information he passed on to London almost prevented a world nuclear conflict.

However, neither his rank nor his position in Soviet society gave him access to the higher echelons of power. Thus he had no information which could have enabled him and his London paymasters to save the world, and there was no threat to the world at that time.

The following is a natural question: Who benefits today from remembering the traitor, and who authorized this feeble performance in which not only was the main protagonist's hair false but also everything else. This was also mentioned at a London press conference, where journalists heard a report given by a spokesman for the USSR Embassy in Britain.

"The following question also arises," our diplomat said. "If we believe the claims made in the British press that the traitor was brought out of the USSR to Finland and then to Britain with the help of British Embassy personnel in Moscow and Helsinki, how does this gel with the generally accepted norms of international law and with the status of official British representatives in foreign countries?"

Of course, the Gordiyevskiy "knot," so to speak, is simple to unravel. There are obviously forces in London that are always ready to somehow cast a shadow over Soviet-British relations at a time when they are showing signs of marked progress. This cannot be tolerated.

FRG Politicians' Warning on '4th Reich' Cited

PM2603103990 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 24 Mar 90 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Threat to Security"]

[Text] A serious threat to the security of peoples in Europe and all over the world in the event of Germany's unification has been pointed out by a group of politicians, scientists, and journalists who have disseminated an open letter on this question in the FRG capital.

In the event of a unification of the FRG and the GDR, the document points out, an economic giant geared to winning a position of dominance would be created in the heart of Europe. Nobody could guarantee that the creation of an economic zone dominated by the FRG Deutsche mark would not be used as a tool of imperialist policy aimed against East Europe and developing states. All declarations concerning linkage between this process and the all-European process and the assurances that nobody is planning to create a "Fourth Reich" could prove to be nothing but empty words.

The declaration about "the Germans' right to self-determination," which is used as a pretext for preparations to swallow the GDR, does not stand up to any close scrutiny. It is hardly possible to talk about freedom of choice when the issue concerns the sellout of the GDR at a bargain basement price by introducing the West German currency there from positions of strength and extending the effect of the FRG legal system to its territory by means of Article 23 of the fundamental law (Constitution).

Swedish Foreign Minister Discusses Baltic States

PM2303152790 Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET in Swedish 22 Mar 90 p 4

[Report on interview with Foreign Ministry Under Secretary of State Pierre Schori by Bitte Hammargren in Moscow; date]

[Text] "We can express our support and sympathy for the efforts to achieve independence and call on the Soviet side not to resort to unwarranted methods of applying pressure," Foreign Ministry Under Secretary of State Pierre Schori said when asked in Moscow in an interview with SVENSKA DAGBLADET to describe the situation between Lithuania and the leadership.

The situation has been described by many as a war of nerves. Pierre Schori was unwilling to subscribe to this view.

"There is a process of negotiation taking place and the situation is highly charged.

"For Lithuanians, Estonians, and Latvians there is now a possibility of achieving the dream of independence. They—like Palestinians and South Africans, for example—have a right to realize their right to self-determination, but there must be negotiations, according to the Soviet Constitution and according to the Helsinki document."

Members of the Lithuanian Parliament have themselves talked about worries that the Soviet Union will choke off vital energy supplies, at the same time as fears have been expressed that Moscow will resort to military might to force the Lithuanians to yield and to cancel their declaration of independence.

"I do not want to speculate about what could happen. We have noted that Foreign Minister Shevardnadze has said that the military will not be deployed. And we make the appeal that other unwarranted means of applying pressure should not be used," Schori said.

The parties in the Swedish Riksdag, with the exception of the Greens, are today agreed that Sweden cannot give immediate recognition to Lithuania as an independent state. There is a territory, there is a people, but that people does not have control over the territory, and for this reason there is no foundation in international law for recognition, it is said.

Pierre Schori makes the comparison with Palestine, which the Palestine National Council declared an independent state in Algiers in 1988.

What sort of control over the territory would then be the prerequisite for Swedish recognition? Would control over the military be necessary, for example?

"I do not want to go into that. There are parallels in history which I am also unwilling to draw. But there must be an agreement between the parties involved," Schori replied.

In the foreign affairs debate in the Riksdag a week ago Foreign Minister Sten Andersson spoke of Sweden's "peculiar possibilities of aiding the Baltic peoples." Now that there is a risk that the hour of destiny is approaching for Lithuania, should Sweden not do more to demonstrate its support?

"We are already doing more than others. We are doing everything that can be done to support calm developments. We are stating that all peoples have the right of self-determination and we have spoken directly to the Soviet leadership about the Baltic region."

It is clear that there is a Swedish contingency plan for an emergency situation in the Baltic region, but the Foreign Ministry under secretary of state was careful not to go into any detail about it. Nor was he willing to say whether there are any contingency plans for receiving Baltic boat people in a crisis situation.

In the Estonian capital, Tallinn, Sweden has opened a subsidiary of the consulate general in Leningrad, and another will be opened shortly in the Latvian capital, Riga. Would it not be fitting to open a similar subsidiary consulate in Vilnius, too?

"We have not reached a decision on this, but in all probability such a subsidiary consulate would not be the same as that in Tallinn. We have been thinking more in terms of opening an information bureau in Vilnius. For one thing there is not the same need in Lithuania—in Estonia and Latvia interest in Sweden is very great, whereas Lithuania has oriented itself more toward Poland and Germany—and also I do not think it would be welcome in Vilnius if Sweden were to open a subsidiary to its consulate general in Leningrad. For several reasons the original idea—that of an information bureau—is the best."

There have long been plans for Pierre Schori to lead a Swedish cultural delegation to Lithuania. The delegation is expected to travel to Lithuania in April, after Easter. The plans were drawn up long before the declaration of independence in Vilnius.

According to information received by SVENSKA DAGBLADET, the visit has caused the Swedish Foreign Ministry some headaches given the current political situation in Lithuania. What political significance could such a visit, led by the Swedish foreign minister's right-hand man, have?

"We have been planning this for a long time, and what will be will be," Pierre Schori said.

[Hammargren] Could this be a cause of irritation to Moscow?
[Schori] "I do not think so. I really have no idea."

[Hammargren] What view does the new leadership in Vilnius take?
[Schori] "You will have to ask them. Our plans remain firm."

[Hammargren] What is the future scenario which the Swedish Foreign Ministry is taking as its point of departure as far as the Baltic region is concerned?
[Schori] "It is a question not of whether the Baltic states will gain their freedom, but of when and how. Everyone would be wise to look to a future in which these states are independent," Pierre Schori said.

FRG Permitted To Inspect Military Exercise

LD2003202990 Moscow TASS in English 1352 GMT 20 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 20 TASS—It has been officially announced here that on Sunday the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany applied to the Soviet Union with a request to make an inspection on the territory of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] in view of an exercise of Soviet troops.

In January this year all states which participated in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe were notified about the exercise and foreign observers were invited to observe it.

A positive reply was given to the West German Government on Monday.

An inspection group, consisting of four officers of the FRG's Armed Forces, arrived in the Soviet Union today.

Supreme Soviet Session

Moscow TV Carries 26 Mar Supreme Soviet Session

Lukyanov Chairs Session

LD2603164390

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1500 GMT on 26 March begins carrying a recorded relay of the 26 March USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin. The session is chaired by Supreme Soviet Chairman Lukyanov who asks the deputies to register and declare that there is a quorum. He announces the session open.

Lukyanov says it is necessary to return to discussion of a draft decision on further work. A rough work schedule has been drawn up, but Lukyanov stresses that it is rough and will undoubtedly be affected by the mass of work upcoming in May. He suggests that there is no real need for discussion and puts the draft to a vote. It is accepted.

At 1506 GMT Lukyanov says that parliament is now starting discussion of the draft law on local self-government and local economy. We have already discussed the conception of the law, he reminds them. The floor is given to Deputy Pivovarov.

At 1508 GMT Pivovarov who is a member of the Committee for Work of Soviets of People's Deputies, Development of Government and Self-Government, recalls previous discussion and that the draft has been published nationwide. There have been many proposals, he says, and many people have taken part in its revision; he enumerates the groups who have participated. Foreign experience has also been studied, he adds. He says that grass roots views have been taken into consideration and the press and media have also participated in the discussion—all constructive proposals have been reflected in the new revised draft. The draft should ensure that local problems and issues can be resolved at the local level, he believes, and the independence of local soviets should thereby be guaranteed. He enumerates some of the major changes to the draft. New articles have been included strengthening the concept of the draft. New articles have been included strengthening the concept of self-government.

Pivovarov explains that the concept of a primary organization of local self-government has been introduced at the suggestion of many at grassroots level. Local soviets are seen as the main body of local self-government and they are to be given power to develop their territory. The relationship between local soviets and higher bodies should be changed, ruling out command-based administrative methods, he states. The article on local soviets' powers has been changed to enhance their powers and independence. Local initiative and diversity of approach to government and economic management must be stimulated, Pivovarov adds.

Pivovarov looks in general at the problems encountered in the country regarding local self-government. He looks at the concept of communal ownership and its advantages and at the concept of local economy and its composition in general. Discussion of the draft has shown that most people who have sent in proposals support the independence of local soviets and noninterference in their affairs by higher bodies, he explains. The section of the draft on local budgets has been significantly enhanced by proposals. Changes in local budgets will help to develop and improve local amenities. New jobs will be created and social tension eased, he says.

Pivovarov then goes on to look at foreign experience in taxation and at the range of sources of finance for local budgets. He believes that the draft should contain the basic principles of local self-government, allowing union republics and local bodies to apply it in accordance with local traditions and conditions. He lists certain new norms included in the draft to strengthen the rights of local soviets and citizens. Unified approaches have been worked out with a number of Supreme Soviet committees and commissions, he says. The committee has also presented a draft decision on the procedure for implementing the law when adopted. The adoption of this draft is vital, especially bearing in mind the local elections now taking place. Pivovarov concludes his speech at 1546 GMT by calling for support.

Debate on Self-Government Law Continues

LD2603165290

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1546 GMT on 26 March continues its recorded relay of the 26 March USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin.

Lukyanov says several notes have been handed in. He suggests that Pivovarov sit down and then looks at the parliamentary procedure book to determine what should happen next. He reminds deputies that this is the second reading of the draft. He suggests certain comments should be heard prior to article-by-article voting on the draft. Deputies, he suggests, should debate the draft but that this should be limited to two hours; five minutes speaking time is the limit.

At 1550 GMT Boldyrev, as a member of the Committee on Work of Deputies, says that Lukyanov has overlooked the fact that he asked to speak specially. Lukyanov says he will be given the floor. Gryazin calls for the leader of the minority to be given the right to speak. Lukyanov pointed out that Boldyrev wants to make a personal point. Lukyanov stresses that the time for speaking conceptually about the draft ended with the first reading.

At 1554 GMT Deputy Yarovaya says that there is much talk about giving real power to local soviets but stresses that at the local soviet very little has happened. There is a need for real economic independence, she believes.

Structural restructuring is vital for the local infrastructure and the budget should be structured from the bottom up. Taxation of citizens should be left up to local soviets. The more we consider the proposals by the people, the better and fuller the law will be she asserts. She supports the draft. People should be paid according to the productivity of their work, she ends.

At 1600 GMT Lukyanov thanks Yarovaya but stresses that they are discussing the draft, not speaking about the problems of local soviets.

Deputy Desyatov supports the draft but makes some suggestions on behalf of the Committee on Ecology on specific articles. No interference should be allowed in the budgets passed by local soviets, once these have been passed. It is also desirable to define more precisely what is and what is not against the law taxation wise, Desyatov believes.

At 1608 GMT there is a 15-minute break in the recorded relay.

Bill Supported 'On the Whole'

LD2603175890

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1623 GMT on 26 March resumes its recorded relay of the 26 March USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin.

At 1632 GMT Lukyanov reminds the deputies that the point here is to combine local interests with statewide interests.

At 1633 GMT Kucherenko takes the floor. Ever since the first reading, the draft has been changed thoroughly, he says. If we should decide that income tax is given in its entirety to the local budget we will get some local budgets which are higher and some which are lower, because this depends on the number of people living in a given area, the number and profitability of enterprises situated there and so forth. That is why we have other taxes, such as, for instance, the turnover tax, to even things out, Kucherenko explains. As for territorial taxes, we have in the USSR a single, unified taxation system and there is no need to introduce yet another tax in our country, he believes. He is, on the whole, for the draft bill.

At 1638 GMT Iskakova takes the floor. She says the draft bill needs fine tuning, but she supports it, on the whole. Local self-government bodies must be responsible for local educational facilities, she says. These bodies must take an active part in educating the population and environmental protection measures. Local authorities must also be responsible for the maintenance and welfare of local workers who have been laid off while the latter are trying to find other jobs. However, the material and economic base of local soviets can do with improvements, she opines.

At 1642 GMT Shekhovtsov says the concept of communal ownership is a hollow one. To base local self-government on this concept is wrong, he believes. We must enshrine the idea of local economy in our laws. As for finances, the draft makes inadequate provisions for local budgets—far too much is siphoned off for the needs of the all-union budget. Our own deputies must tackle our own problems and it is our own money that must be used to finance this, he states.

At 1647 GMT Neumyvakin says public organizations, such as, for instance, the Charity Fund, are concerned that they will not be able to make ends meet. In other countries, public organizations are financed from central sources, but this is not the case in our country, he points out. The Society for the Partially Sighted, or the veterans' and invalids' organizations are already experiencing financial difficulties. These organizations ought to be exempt from dues of any kind. If this is done, we will barely be able to survive, says the speaker.

At 1652 GMT Yetylen says that Soviets at different levels ought to have different powers and prerogatives. Various articles ought to be correspondingly amended, so that each type of territory benefits in the same way, he says. The norms governing local payments, taxes and financing ought to ensure that the principle of local self-sufficiency is not broached, he concludes.

Deputies Offer Amendments

LD2603191190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1700 GMT on 26 March continues its recorded relay of the 26 March USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin.

Deputy Fominykh says that tax benefits should be used to beef up local budgets, replacing the proposed provisions whereby local budgets will be made good from central resources. Local budgets ought not to be interfered with if local soviets are to function as they ought to. All taxes ought to go to local budgets, says the speaker.

At 1705 GMT Deputy Kalmykov takes the floor to speak on behalf of the legislative committee and addresses issues connected with the definition of local economy, as opposed to municipal economy. He goes on to discuss issues of independence of local authorities which receive grants from superior bodies.

At 1710 GMT Deputy Alekseyev makes suggestions to reword various formulations in the bill, speaking also as a local rayon deputy. Lukyanov says such amendments should be worked out in committee. He announces a 20-minute recess.

At 1715 GMT Lukyanov asks the deputies to register. Deputy Khomyakov says he hopes that delegated legislation for implementing the bill under debate will be adopted quickly as possible. He proceeds to suggest further amendments to different articles of the debated document.

At 1724 GMT Deputy Yemelyanov takes the floor. He clarifies the definition of municipal—as opposed to state—property and also says that incoming taxes should be collected at the local level and part of them passed on higher up rather than vice versa. He also argues that as much power as possible should be transferred to housing estate committees, to allow people as much say as possible in the running of their local affairs.

At 1729 GMT Deputy Khmura, who is also the chairman of a local soviet, calls for the bill to be adopted in the second reading, to allow local bodies of power run their own affairs as soon as possible.

At 1734 GMT Deputy Feskov, speaking on behalf of a subcommission of the planning and budget commission, suggests some further amendments to the wording of the article regulating local budgets and taxation.

At 1739 GMT Deputy Travkin says that the law on local power is required very urgently. Many local deputies will be watching this broadcast expecting to find answers to various urgent questions. As much power as possible should be handed down to local level. Also the local bodies themselves should decide what kind of staff and officers they should have.

At 1745 GMT Deputy Medikov highlights some of the shortcomings in the draft. Towns, rayons and villages will be dictated to by local bodies, instead of central bodies and local diktat is even worse, he says.

At 1753 GMT Deputy Koryugin takes the lecturn to make suggestions about re-editing certain formulations in order to simplify them. He also proposes amendments to the wording of the article concerning the revenues of local bodies, so that there are no contradictions with all-union legislation. Local authorities should be able to collect taxes but not set them.

At 1801 GMT Deputy Ignatov of the commission for socioeconomic development of the republics says that the commission generally supports the bill but deems certain amendments necessary. These apply to articles defining the economic basis of the operation of local bodies.

'Ambiguities' Need Clarification

LD2603195190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1806 GMT on 26 March continues its recorded relay of the 26 March USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin.

Deputy Kutepov of the industry commission questions the provisions subordinating industry to local authorities, since this immediately raises questions as far as industries of more than local importance are concerned. It should also be left to the local bodies to decide which bank they have their accounts at. This should not be determined by legislation.

At 1810 GMT Deputy Magomedov, who is also a rayon soviet chairman, praises the bill because it gives more power to the soviets but he feels there are amiguities which need to be clarified. Adequate provisions should be made for the accountability of representatives of central bodies to local authorities and for the latters' monitoring role in environmental protection.

At 1816 GMT Deputy Nosov says that while objectives can only be attained by trial and error, there is not much room left for error. He illustrates by the example of his own local area how centrally made decisions can harm local interests if there are no strong local safeguards. Nosov suggests amendments to the wording of some articles.

At 1822 GMT the floor is taken by Deputy Kim, who, referring to specific articles and clauses, sugests rewording which would eliminate what he thinks are inconsistencies and internal contradictions in the document submitted for the deputies' consideration.

At 1828 GMT Deputy Neyelov raises procedural issues when all this should have been discussed in the committees. He believes the law clashes with the recently adopted law on the presidency.

At 1832 GMT Deputy Vidiker comments on the draft and provisions for local budgets. He suggests ways of enhancing the financial resources of local soviets. Local and nationwide interests both need to be taken into account, he believes.

At 1836 GMT Mongo comments positively on the content and style of the draft. He makes some specific suggestions to the draft. He suggests changing the name of the draft.

By 1840 GMT 26 of those who asked to speak have done so. Lukyanov suggests that debates on the draft in the second reading be ended and the parliament move on to hear the government's report.

A vote decides to end the debates. He asks those who did not speak to hand in their remarks to the committee. A break in the proceedings is announced.

Lithuanian Decision on Deputies Rejected

LD2603201990

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1843 GMT on 26 March continues its recorded relay of the 26 March Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin.

The session resumes after the break. Lukyanov says the parliament is ending discussion of the draft. Deputy Yerokhin has asked to speak specially. He notes that the parliament has been working for exactly a year. He refers to a Council of Ministers decision of 1989 with regard to the ability of a local enterprise to earn foreign currency. Foreign currency cannot go right down to the local level to benefit it, he says. This situation should be altered, and the draft should take this situation into account. He believes the law should be adopted following further revision.

At 1849 GMT an unidentified deputy speaks from the floor asking for an expert's opinion on the law. Pavlov takes the floor. He presents the views and ideas of the government on the draft under discussion. He says the government wanted a law to grant greater independence for local soviets. He believes that many articles of the draft confirm the fears of the government that such independence would be hampered. On foreign economic activity, Pavlov stresses that it should made clear in the draft on what basis this economic activity is carried out. He believes that the barter method of trade is highly disadvantageous for the USSR. Local soviets should be encouraged to find ways of reaching financial norms rather than relying, as the draft envisages, on higher bodies to supplement finances. He makes some suggestions on taxation and which budgets should receive tax revenue.

At 1859 GMT Pivovarov returns to the floor to respond to questions and remarks. He expresses satisfaction with the way the debates have been held. No one can remain indifferent to this law. Many proposals have been repeated. The committee will defend some of its stances because it believes strongly in them. He says that all the proposals will be examined by the committee very carefully. There will be a meeting of the committee at 1000 GMT tomorrow and he invites all those who are interested to attend.

He then starts responding to some of the points raised in the debates. The role of the primary organization is being raised and this is very important. He defends the committee's stance on taxation in the draft. The basis of the law is to ensure the establishment of the real power of soviets and to provide a mechanism for these soviets to be financed. Pivovarov responds to written questions at some length.

At 1917 GMT Lukyanov interjects with a joke, Pivovarov continues. He hopes that this draft law can be used to work out local budgets for next year. On the call for charity and invalid organizations to be exempt from taxation, he says that he agrees but this is a matter for the law on taxation to cover. Other questions will be considered during work in committee, he assures them.

At 1929 GMT Deputy Yablokov raises a procedural point concerning conciliation between commissions and committees when there are disagreements between these bodies at committee stage. Lukyanov says every law cannot possibly take into consideration every single aspect of life.

At 1933 GMT Deputy Ivashko makes a brief contribution from the floor to say that laws should be workable.

At 1934 GMT Deputies Travkin and Yudin suggest that the bill should be voted on it its present form to give local authorities the law they need. Deputy Gulyayev raises a further procedural point on commission stage.

At 1939 GMT Lukyanov moves that the bill be sent back to committee for a further 7 days and then be returned to the two houses for an article-by-article vote. The motion is passed.

At 1944 GMT Lukyanov says the sitting has to take a view on the decision by the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet concerning the status of Lithuanian people's deputies. A decision prepared in committee is put to a vote once Lukyanov establishes there is no call for a debate on the subject. The resolution states that the decision by the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, depriving USSR People's Deputies elected from the Lithuanian SSR of their status, is invalid. The resolution is passed by 338 votes against 7, with 35 abstentions.

The recorded relay ends at 1948 GMT.

Supreme Soviet To Hold Joint Session 27 Mar

LD2703024890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0100 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] At yesterday's session of our country's Supreme Soviet, the deputies basically approved the draft law on general principles for local self-government and the local economy in the country. Work on this document will be continued in the committees and commissions, taking the amendments and comments into account. A decision also was made confirming the rights of USSR people's deputies elected from Lithuania. At the joint session of the chambers today it is also proposed to consider draft laws relating to taxation of citizens.

Supreme Soviet Discusses Taxation Bills

LD2703081290 Moscow TASS in English 0714 GMT 27 Mar 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow March 27 TASS—The full Soviet parliament today began to discuss a package of three taxation bills.

One of the bills determines income rates, another envisages a stage-by-stage cancellation of the bachelor tax and the third stipulates the rights of state tax inspectorates.

These bills are part of a series of new legislative acts directed towards economic reform. The most important legislative acts dealing with ownership and land have already been adopted.

The Soviet parliament's current third session, which began in mid-February, will continue approximately one month longer than originally expected—until May 25.

Within this period the parliament is expected to adopt laws on renewal of the union treaty, the separation of powers between the union and the republics, a procedure for the resolution of matters connected with a union republic's secession from the USSR, the provision of pensions for citizens, a single programme for the elimination of the aftermath of the Chernobyl accident, a law on the press and a number of other legislative acts.

Finance Minister Submits Tax Reform Bills

LD2703102190 Moscow TASS in English 0939 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 27 TASS—Soviet Finance Minister Valentin Pavlov submitted three bills on tax reform to parliament today.

The Soviet tax system, which was formed in the 1940, he said, has become outdated: there are now new forms of property in the country, the low-paid category of people is reducing, while highly paid categories of people are on the rise. The number of people with a monthly wage of under 90 roubles will reduce by seven times from 1981 to 1995, while the number of people with a monthly wage of over 300 roubles will increase six-fold.

The new system presupposes a rise in the no-tax minimum from 80 to 90 roubles, and easy tax rates on a wage of under 150 roubles. The tax rate on super-high earnings (over 3,000 roubles a month) may reach 60 per cent.

The new progressive income tax puts state enterprise employees, members of cooperative organisations and workers in art on a par. Foreigners with permament residence in the USSR will also be covered by the law.

The tax on single people and small family citizens is planned to be cancelled stage by stage within 1991-1993.

A tax declaration will be the main income refining instrument. A tax inspectorate, vested with broad powers, is planned to be formed to deal with tax evasion.

Lithuanian Decision on Deputies Rejected

LD2603181790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 26 Mar 90

[from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] On 13 March, 1990, the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet adopted a decision depriving the USSR People's Deputies elected from the Republic of their legal status. The resolution of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet says that its citizens do not have the right, without special permission from the Lithuanian Republic Supreme Council to take part in the work of the supreme bodies of other states, including the USSR.

In connection with the situation that has developed, as well as requests which have been received from deputies, the USSR Supreme Soviet examined this issue at its sitting on 26 March. It was noted that in accordance with Article 106 of the USSR Constitution and Article 2 of the USSR Law on the Status of People's Deputies in the USSR, the powers of USSR People's Deputies are determined by Union legislation. They can only be halted in the event of a deputy's being recalled by the voters, or the public organization which elected him, or by a decision of a Congress of USSR People's Deputies or the USSR Supreme Soviet. On this basis, the USSR Supreme Soviet passed a resolution that the decision of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet, depriving USSR People's Deputies elected from the Lithuanian SSR of their status, is invalid. An instruction has been given to the bodies of state power and government of the Lithuanian SSR and the relevant bodies of the USSR to ensure that the rights of USSR People's Deputies, guaranteed them by the USSR Constitution and the USSR Law on the Status of People's Deputies in the USSR, are implemented on the territory of the Lithuanian SSR.

Local Self-Government Bill Discussed

LD2603154990 Moscow TASS in English 1531 GMT 26 Mar 90

Moscow March 26 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The two chambers of the Soviet parliament at a joint sitting today discussed the second reading of a bill on general principles of local self-government and local economy.

The bill was approved in its first reading last autumn and then offered for a nationwide discussion. About 10,000 proposals and amendments to the bill have been offered since then. Most of them were taken into account in the revised draft.

The bill was submitted to parliament today by Nikolay Pivovarov, chairman of the Committee for the Operation of Soviets of People's Deputies.

He said the bill was intended to "radically restructure, rather than to facelift," the system of local self-government bodies. It outlines only general principles of local self-government. Constituent republics must work out the details.

One of the bill's most important features is the fundamentally different division of powers between superior and inferior authorities, as compared with current legislation. The bill delegates to superior authorities only those functions that cannot be implemented at a lower level.

The bill makes all decisions of local self-government bodies binding for all public organisations. It also envisions the possibility of suspending decisions of governmental bodies, including federal ones, on the given territory.

Most speakers who participated in the discussion called for the early adoption of the bill. At the same time, many amendments were proposed.

Yuriy Kalmykov, chairman of the Parliamentary Legislation Committee, opposed a provision giving local soviets (councils) the right to independently fix taxes.

Deputy Nikolay Travkin of Moscow proposed a provision prohibiting local party leaders from taking the post of chairman of the Soviet of People's Deputies.

The parliament instructed its committees and commissions to consider today's proposals and amendments within a week and to submit the bill to the vote.

Nationalities Council Passes Bills

LD2603171390 Moscow TASS in English 1650 GMT 26 Mar 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow March 26 TASS—The Council of Nationalities—one of Soviet parliament's two chambers—today approved two bills in the first reading: on the procedure for resolving issues connected with the withdrawal of a constituent republic from the union, and on the obligations and rights of USSR Interior Ministry troops when protecting public order.

Both bills were discussed by the Council of Nationalities and the Council of the Union at separate sittings last week and already adopted by the latter.

After today's vote in the Council of Nationalities, the bills were submitted to parliamentary committees and commissions for amendments. Then they will be submitted to the Supreme Soviet for the second reading discussion.

Last week, the two chambers also approved a bill on the renewal of the Union Treaty and delimitation of powers between the union and republics in the first reading but disagreed on its name.

It was decided not to set up a conciliatory commission of the two chambers but to send the bill to committees and commissions and then to constituent republics for discussion and amendments.

The Council of Nationalities set up a commission to consider restoring the Ingush Autonomous Republic, which existed in the northern Caucasus until 1934.

The Ingush were one of the ethnic minorities that suffered during Stalin's repressions. Their rights were restored in postwar years. Now the Ingush live in the Chechen-Ingush Autonomous Republic.

The commission is not seeking to settle an ethnic conflict but to delineate the national terriories populated by the Ingush.

The commission includes representatives of the Ingush, Chechen and northern Ossetian population, as this issue concerns all the three ethnic groups.

Political & Social

Girenko Interviewed on Gorbachev's Role

LD1603120890 Moscow World Service in Russian 1030 GMT 16 Mar 90

[From the "Soviet Chronicle" feature of the "Soviet Union Day by Day" program; report attributed to INTERFAX]

[Text] Here is "Soviet Chronicle." It is opened by a report by the INTERFAX independent news agency. Secretary of the party Central Committee Andrey Girenko said in an interview with an INTERFAX correspondent that in his view now, in the conditions of a crisis in interethnic relations, the Soviet president will have to face great difficulties. Girenko believes that the republics will block many of his decisions, asserting their rights and greater independence. On the whole this is correct, Girenko stressed, because the distortion in favor of centralized power has so far been evident. I place great hopes in the Federal Council, the new body attached to the president.

To the correspondent's question as to whether Gorbachev's being busy in the post of USSR president would not affect the work of the Central Committee Secretariat, Andrey Girenko said: Gorbachev only sometimes chairs the Secretariat. Usually the Secretariat meets under the chairmanship of one of the members of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. In particular a few meetings of the Secretariat were conducted by Vadim Medvedev. Thus, Girenko stressed, other members of the Politburo are helping Gorbachev in his work.

Presidential Council Appointee Views New Post

LD2603140190 Moscow TASS in English 1312 GMT 26 Mar 90

[Text] Riga March 26 TASS—By TASS corespondent Galina Kuchina:

"Mikhail Gorbachev's offer to become a member of the USSR Presidential Council was completely unexpected," Albert Kauls admitted, upon accepting congratulations on the appointment.

The telephone in the office of the chairman of the Adazi agrofirm kept ringing last Sunday. Kauls not only accepted congratulations but also contacted scientists and farm directors in various areas of the country.

"I am glad that colleagues promised to help me by recommendations and ideas. These will be very valuable to me as a member of the presidential council, or, to be more exact, adviser to the president for agrarian affairs," said Kauls whose entire life has been connected with the countryside.

"When I was summoned by Gorbachev on Thursday, March 22, I was sure that purely rural affairs would be the subject of the meeting," Kauls said.

"Upon hearing an offer to become a member of the Presidential Council, I at first declined the offer, pointing out that I had too many duties already, including those of USSR people's deputy. But after the president's words 'I want to see people believing in perestroyka around me,' I realised that I'd got to agree to such an appointment."

Kauls repeatedly declined offers of appointment to high posts: He did not agree to head the agro-industrial committee of Latvia several years ago and did not yield to solicitations to become the republic's prime minister. For 16 years now he has been remaining committed to the Adazi agrofirm, the net profit of which has grown over the period from three to 46 million roubles a year.

Recently Kauls was elected the head of the Latvian agrarians union, which has already submitted its plan of agrarian reform to the government, listing both competition between various forms of ownership, the freedom to produce and manage the fruits of one's labour, and so on. It has been suggested to transform collective farms into joint-stock companies or cooperative societies.

This proposal is criticised by those who want to distribute land as soon as possible as private property among its former owners and inheritors. But Kauls believes that one should not break up farms which produce one-third more food than Latvia needs.

He is not against returning lands to those who were deprived of them in the 1940s, but is against a new injustice that may be done in the process.

He is calling for a reasonable compromise by saying that "it is very easy to set people against one another by dividing the property but is it of benefit to Latvia?"

In a recent appearance on republican television, Kauls posed this question: "Would it be of benefit to Latvia to totally negate the 50 years of its life and would not this humiliate those who honestly worked and raised children?"

Kauls has both supporters and opponents. Some do not accept his hard nature. But all are unanimous that Kauls is a character.

Recently, at the age of 52, he became one of 4,000 farmers of Latvia: A land plot with an area of 100 hectares was alotted to him near the town of Cesis.

He has got assistants in farming—three sons, a daughter-in-law and other relatives. Kauls told the Soviet president about his wish to be closer to the land. And Gorbachev responded by saying "I think the new appointment will not interfere with your plans."

Presidential Council Member Yarin Interviewed

PM2703091190 Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 27 Mar 90 p 1

["Interview for the Issue" with USSR People's Deputy V. Yarin, member of the USSR Presidential Council, by correspondent Yu. Skidanov: "The Presidency Is for the People. Urals Worker V. Yarin Reflects on the New Constitutional Form of Power"; place, date not given; first paragraph is RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA introduction]

[Text] So, the first Presidential Council is taking shape. Rolling mill operator V. Yarin, USSR people's deputy from Nizhniy Tagil, has become one of its members. He answered a RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA correspondent's questions:

[Skidanov] On congratulating you on your new appointment, Veniamin Aleksandrovich, one gets a complex feeling: The problems that the Presidential Council will be involved in solving are too acute....

[Yarin] Thank you for the congratulations. But the problems.... Chief among them is the fact that many people are beginning to lose confidence in the top organs of state power. In the sense that they do not always guarantee a definite level of social protection today. This is on the one hand. On the other—every working person pays considerable taxes in order to have an effective executive apparatus of people's power. Whereas all seems to be in order with regard to the number of state employees, with regard to executive power, alas.... In my opinion, it is one of the Presidential Council's chief tasks to help to revive the prestige of power. To ensure that people believe that the presidency will act in the name of the people and for the people. The council's personnel makeup accords with the attainment of this goal. Many people have probably noticed that, unlike the analogous body in the United States, for example, the Presidential Council includes, in addition to professional politicians, also a peasant, esteemed writers, a well-known economist.... I consider this quite a revealing phenomenon in the development of democracy—the long-standing proposals to include working people on top state formations are being realized.

[Skidanov] I will add that, in my view, all the "nonprofessionals," so to speak, on the Presidential Council have merited their prestige with people through their philanthropic stance, which is far removed from short-term considerations....

[Yarin] In short, the Presidential Council will, I believe, serve as a guarantee against ill-considered decisions and also against the ambitions of those forces (alas, they have representatives even among USSR people's deputies) which are blinded by the desire to grab power. Or to use it in interests alien to genuine socialism.

[Skidanov] Yet "nonprofessionals...." Are you able to assess a particular situation quite competently? Will you not turn into the token worker on duty beside the president—which is, I foresee, what some people will accuse you of being?

[Yarin] At a recent sitting of the USSR Supreme Soviet session an "observer" deputy from Estonia declared that "the masks have been thrown off." I subscribe to this opinion. Thank you glasnost for defining who wants what. Including those who wish without fail to see a worker, a peasant, or a diligent member of the intelligentsia as a token person beside someone who has appropriated the right to the absolute truth. I will say this of myself: I have never felt myself to be a "token" anything, for I have always had my own opinion. I have upheld it, although at times, under the pressure of arguments, I have had to rethink certain conclusions. My work on the USSR Supreme Soviet has given me a great deal. It has given me not only the ability to get to the bottom of, let us say, questions of state planning or the budget but also the ability to discern behind outwardly impeccably good appeals not at all good aims. I believe that this will help me on the Presidential Council. Although it will, of course, be difficult: People are pinning very great hopes on the presidency....

Ryzhkov Discusses Presidency, Democracy

PM2103144690 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 11, 13-19 Mar 90 pp 5-6

[Interview with Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov by Nikolay Andreyev: "'We Must Protect Democracy'"—date, place not given]

[Text] New Times: At the session of the Supreme Soviet much is being said about the need to strengthen supreme executive power - in the form of presidency, in particular. Is executive power really as weak as all that?

Nikolay Ryzhkov: Much criticism is levelled against the goverment. However, the off-hand accusations of inactivity heaped on the executive power can hardly be taken seriously. In the current situation we are making effort to lead the country out of crisis. We have our share of setbacks, of course, but this is a different matter.

I think we, all of us, should ponder over the problems of government. Of all the speakers at the session, only a few made it really clear why we need presidential powers. This is not an expediency. Today's problems are pressing, of course, and many think that the solution to them lies in presidency, but we must provide a clearcut definition for that. We must look to the future, I'm sure. It is unwise to confine ourselves to the present day. One should think ahead. It all actually amounts to the regrouping of the government. This is the most important thing. Many fail to realize this and seem to think since things are going badly today, presidency is what we need to remedy the situation.

As a matter of fact, what the current situation boils down to is that one form of government has weakened, and the other hasn't gained strength yet. This explains why we are in such a predicament today. We know only too well who used to make all the decisions before. The Party did, or rather its headquarters. It so happened that since the thirties the Party dealt with all problems. Today the Party is saying: all power should be given to the soviets. Other government bodies should also acquire executive powers. This process is now under way. No power vacuum should be permitted. Whether Party rule was good or bad, it did exist. Now that the regrouping of power is in progress, all power institutions are to be set up to avoid anarchy.

The government has been and remains the government. The draft now under discussion in the Supreme Soviet precisely defines the powers of the government. I do not quite agree with those who insist that the government should be vested with some extraordinary powers. We need no special powers. We must do what the Constitution tells us to. I haven't asked for any extraordinary powers, and I'm not going to ask for them. You can't rule the country by extraordinary measures. You can only resort to them when dealing with one problem. It is only in an emergency situation that a state of emergency can be imposed.

N.T: What link in the state government system is the weakest, in your opinion?

Nikolay Ryzhkov: I think that today no government body is as yet capable of functioning under new conditions. We speak of democratization and glasnost. Indeed, the nation, society, are moving towards democracy, we are making progress, and that's good. Nevertheless, all the three constituent parts of power—legislative, executive and legal—have proved totally unprepared for this situation. They are still to come into their own.

Take the legislative constituent, for instance: the Supreme Soviet, the Congress of People's Deputies. Can one say that everything goes well there? No. Too much talk, overlong discussions. Decisions are not always made on time. Executive power is open to criticism - it often lacks in efficiency and makes half-and-half decisions. Or take the bills the executive authorities tabled back at the beginning of the second session—why did they take so long going through the Supreme Soviet? Mind you, those are vital bills which have to do with the land and property. I signed the bills way back on September 1, and now it's March already. See how much time has elapsed? Legislative power is still not quite past its formative stage. The deputies are just beginning to work, just accummulating experience.

Now, the executive power. Today it is not what it used to be, either. The Council of Ministers is criticized a lot for not using its power. No one has said, however, that the Council of Ministers, with all its executive power, has now found itself in an entirely different situation. This power has lost its former meaning. Enterprises are now protected by law. Can we break laws? No, we can't. Further. The Union Republic is gaining more independence. So on the one hand enterprises and regions are independent and, on the other, the centre is being pressed for a more efficient performance. You see, there are very many discrepancies between our slogans and reality. We are speaking of independence but, as soon as anything goes wrong anywhere, all the blame is laid on the central government.

Executive power should also function in a different way now. The ministries have changed. Previously, a minister would tell a plant manager what to do, and now administration by mere injunction is gone. I think, therefore, that those who criticize the executive authorities for their weakness—or even go into hysterics about it—just fail to realize that the situation has changed.

Lastly, our legal power. Is it beyond reproach? Not quite. I think that bringing pressure to bear on law-enforcement agencies at one time was a bad mistake. And on the judiciary—we hear that the Party used to bring pressure on them. And who is doing so now?

The law-enforcement agencies should function smoothly and maintain law and order, but they are weakened today. They have many shortcomings and often fall short of professional standards. The law-enforcement agencies and the judiciary have not yet learned how to keep pace with the times. But who, if not them, is going to maintain law and order in the country? Our legal power should be strong and reliable.

We are advancing. Sometimes we are doing that without theoretical preparation, by trial and error. There are very many problems to deal with.

N.T: Many deputies say that the Lease Law, passed recently, does not work. They put the blame for that on the executive authorities.

Nikolay Ryzhkov: This law is going to work all right. There are some amendments and additions to it waiting to be signed. They've been lying on my desk for a week now. I haven't signed them yet because I still have some doubts about them. I'm going to ask experts and People's Deputies to take another look at them. One gets the impression that people just don't want to lease land—unless forced to. Everything must take its natural course. It's naive to think otherwise. We can't really expect the laws we pass to start working throughout the country overnight. I think, the lease system will take. What I object to is making collectivization out of it. This shouldn't be done by any means! We shouldn't rush things.

N.T: How would you comment on Deputy Sobachak's words to the effect that a hasty changeover to presidency and fundamental restructurings will throw state power into disarray?

Nikolay Ryzhkov: I do not agree with that. The Council of Ministers remains the country's executive body. A look through the draft will show that the government's functions aren't going to change much. So one shouldn't think that this section of executive power is to undergo substantial changes.

Last year the Council of Ministers appointed the ministers. Before 1989 was out, we endorsed the scheme of government, reduced the number of ministries, and settled all the issues. I told all the ministers: keep working, and don't look back, for God's sake! We can't afford a reshuffle every week. People must feel secure. If we change our structures every three months, now bringing certain units together, now setting them apart again, we shall bring about instability. I believe, therefore, that now we should live in the structure we have already adopted. Why waver?

As for presidential office, it is feared to cause the destabilization of executive power... The Council of Ministers will be actually subordinated to the President. I don't think this will cause any destabilization of executive power. The idea is to reform the power structure, not to realign the state machinery. We need a clear-cut system of governing the country. Consequently, we must adopt the decision on the introduction of presidential power. We must protect democracy. This is the most important thing. If we do nothing, the situation will only worsen.

I'd like to conclude where I've started. It's not that we want a president in a hurry. We must redistribute powers, I mean executive powers, in our state. And, besides, we must try and gain a deeper insight into what's going on, and look further ahead.

Solzhenitsyn Reads Own Works on Television

LD2603193290

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1808 GMT on 26 March carries an 18-minute voice recording of Aleksandr Isayevich Solzhenitsyn reading an excerpt of his book "One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich." The reading is broadcast as the first item in a magazine program entitled "Slovo" [The Word], which is described as a "literary and artistic video channel." Solzhenitsyn is not shown reading; instead, black and white still photographs of Solzhenitsyn, sometimes in a camp uniform, are shown. From time to time, black and white video pictures are superimposed which show industrial and agricultural achievements and other scenes from Soviet life.

The reading consists of scenes illustrative of the daily life and sufferings of labor camp inmates, culminating with the story of how one such prisoner faces a routine body search knowing that he has in his possession an illicite knife which he has inadvertently failed to conceal properly. By good fortune the search ends at the very moment when the knife is about to be discovered and the prisoner escapes the solitary confinement on short rations which would inevitably have been his lot.

No discussion of Solzhenitsyn or his work accompanies the reading.

Interpol Official on USSR Affiliation

90UN1093B Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
3 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 7

[Article by S. Mostovshchikov: "We Are Joining Interpol"]

[Text] The journalists gathered at the press center of the MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] had exactly one hour to address their questions to Mr Raymond Kendall, the general secretary of Interpol, an international organization of criminal police.

The general secretary turned out to be a former employee of Scotland Yard who, according to what he said, was offered a job at Interpol in his time only because he knew French. However, before transferring to his new job Mr Kendall also knew that the Interpol headquarters is located in the city of Lyon (France). As the general secretary said, he did not need a lot of time to familiarize himself with the business of the international organization of criminal police.

The main function of the organization is to assist in sharing qualified information. The enormous Interpol data bank contains data on the international narcotics trade, terrorism, crimes against persons, and shady deals in the economic sphere. Interpol maintains files on specific criminals and has data on the weapons which circulate in the criminal underworld.

At present, 150 countries of the world belong to Interpol, including East European countries—Yugoslavia, Romania, Hungary, and Bulgaria. It is quite simple to join the international organization. At any rate, nobody has ever been turned down or expelled from the organization in the history of Interpol.

Mr Kendall did not conceal that he is in Moscow in order to discuss in more detail the possibility of the USSR joining Interpol, though he also has other business here (he is taking part in the work of the seminar "Crime Prevention Strategy" which is being held in Moscow). The general secretary has already held talks with the Soviet authorities concerning the admission dues which our country will have to pay in Swiss francs upon becoming an Interpol member. By all signs, this is going to be a sizable sum. However, as Mr Kendall stated, there has been no final decision yet, nor has there been an official request. However, this does not mean that some difficulties and differences have surfaced. It is just that time is needed in order to discuss all details, and it is not short: The next Interpol general assembly will be held in Ottawa in September. According to a statement by USSR Minister of Internal Affairs V. Bakatin, the intentions of the USSR are 99.9 percent definite. There are no obstacles to our country becoming an Interpol member in September.

In the opinion of Raymond Kendall, joining his organization will bring benefits to the USSR. The borders which will, perhaps, become more open in the USSR soon will create many new crime-related problems. As the head of Interpol believes, we will encounter problems with which we are absolutely unfamiliar: credit card, checkbook, and counterfeit currency fraud. Besides, there is no guarantee that the Soviet Union will not be used even more extensively for the transit of drugs through its territory.

The general secretary was asked whether his organization intends to have contacts with the KGB. Mr Kendall explained that Interpol is involved in investigating criminal cases and has, and will have, nothing to do with special secret services.

The general secretary said: "This is why I have had no contacts with KGB representatives. At least that's what I think."

Prospects of USSR Joining Interpol Viewed

90UN1093A Moscow TRUD in Russian
3 Mar 90 p 2

[Statement by USSR Minister of Internal Affairs V.V. Bakatin to TASS correspondents Yu. Soltys and P. Cheremushkin: "A Barrier to International Crime"]

[Text] USSR Minister of Internal Affairs V.V. Bakatin stated that the USSR is in favor of joining Interpol. However, this is predetermined by the schedule of annual congresses of the international organization of criminal police, and we cannot join before the next congress which is to be held by the end of the year. He explained that, hopefully, everything will be prepared by then.

At the request of TASS correspondents, the minister commented on the results of the international "Crime Prevention Strategy" meeting which was held in Moscow.

He said: "Our country has begun to cooperate with UN institutions on the issues of crime control, and it is logical to hold such a seminar here. Its topic is very current. From the point of view of building a law-governed state, the issues of crime prevention are very significant.

"The UN European Center for Social Development and Humanitarian Issues which is headed by Margaret Ensti [name as published] proposed that the seminar be held in the USSR. She proposed this during her visit to the USSR, and we agreed.

"For the first time, a community of scientists studying these topics gathered in Moscow. Listening to them, looking at the methods of their work, and studying their experience yields tremendous practical results. We will report the results of the seminar to the government, and we will adopt recommendations."

The minister noted that at present law enforcement organs do encounter cases which can only be solved through contacts with the appropriate organs of other countries, in cooperation with a particular country. Meanwhile, we do not have a legal basis for such work, for example, for apprehending a person. Due to the absence of agreements, we are forced to go through diplomatic channels in each case. This harms current operations. If there is an international agreement, a pertinent legislative mechanism will take effect, and the Interpol headquarters in our country will begin operations. All problems will be solved through direct contacts between, say, two officers.

Until now, we considered the creation of such a law-enforcement institution in our country impossible; but times are changing. Criminals have turned out to be more mobile; they go abroad without a problem. The effectiveness of what we are doing is negligible. Coordination between the customs, the KGB, and the Ministry of Internal Affairs is lacking. At present, cooperation programs on a more precise and firm basis are being worked out.

Further on Ligachev Report to Veterans on Platform

PM2003142390 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 17 Mar 90 Single Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Veterans Hold Discussion"]

[Text] A plenum of the All-Union Council of War and Labor Veterans was held in Moscow on 16 March to discuss the CPSU Central Committee's draft platform for the 28th party congress. Ye.K. Ligachev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the Central Committee, gave the report.

The draft platform, the speaker noted, gives political guidance for our movement toward genuinely humane, democratic socialism, for resolving the complex tasks of perestroyka which have arisen. People—their interests and concerns—are increasingly becoming the focus of the party's policy. The acute situation which has taken shape in the country and in the party is the result both of objective difficulties and also errors and mistakes tolerated in the implementation of the plans for renewing all aspects of public life. At the same time the main danger to perestroyka emanates from forces of a nationalist, separatist, and antisocialist persuasion.

The establishment of the post of USSR president is intended to strengthen central power. In order to cope with the difficulties which have arisen, we need a single, united party and we need to distance ourselves from those forces which are undermining it from within. It is necessary to raise the role and responsibility of communists and primary party organizations and to be ready to operate in the conditions of a multiparty system. The party is capable of improvement and perestroyka. The central questions is the strengthening of the CPSU's ties with public organizations, movements, formations of working people, young people, war and labor veterans, and the Armed Forces.

During the discussion the plenum participants introduced a number of proposals on the draft CPSU Central Committee platform and criticized the party's Central Committee.

The plenum adopted an appeal from the All-Union Council of War and Labor Veterans to the CPSU Central Committee on the draft CPSU Central Committee platform for the 28th party congress.

Marshal of the Soviet Union N.V. Ogarkov was elected chairman of the All-Union Council of War and Labor Veterans.

Ogarkov Elected Chairman of Veterans Group

LD1603232590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 16 Mar 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Today a plenum of the All-Union Council of War and Labor Veterans took place in Moscow.

[Sedov, identified by caption] Among other issues, an organizational issue was also put before the plenum. It was to elect a new chairman of the all-Union veterans' organization. This is how the candidacy of Marshal of the Soviet Union Ogarkov was received. [loud applause is heard] Those sitting in the hall know Nikolay Vasilyevich well. Some were with him at the front; some served under his leadership in the post-war years. Many know him as the chief of the General Staff in the 1970's. The alternative candidates withdrew in the fact of the merit and authority of this major military commander. [addresses Ogarkov] Nikolay Vasilyevich, allow me, first of all, to congratulate you on your election, which was so unanimous, and, I would even say, inspired.

[Ogarkov] Thank you.

[Sedov] Well, and this is the question I would like to ask you: What idea would you like most of all to embody at this post?

[Ogarkov] Our nearest task, which concerns our veterans' organization directly, is the forthcoming 45th anniversary of the great victory of the Soviet people, who went through the difficult Great Patriotic War.

Of course, there is also a lot of work concerned with spreading our ideas, because veterans are the most firm adherents of the ideas of Great October, firm defendants of the ideas of socialism, and firm defenders of our immutable Soviet patriotism.

[Announcer] Comrade Ligachev took part in the plenum of the All-Union Council of War and Labor Veterans.

[video shows the plenum in deliberation, Ligachev sitting with others on the platform, Ogarkov talking to Sedov]

Radio, TV Committee Head on Current Trends

LD2003210790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1830 GMT 17 Mar 90

[From the "Topical Interview" program]

[Excerpt] Our next piece is designed for those who are interested in how television broadcasting is to develop in our country. First, thought, let us introduce our conversation partner for today.

[First presenter] So, the latest acquaintance in our "Who's Who" section: Genrikh Zigmundovich Yushkyavicius, deputy chairman of the USSR Gostelradio [State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting]. [also identified by caption as head of Intervision]

[Second presenter] Genrikh Zigmundovich, let me start with what might be an unpleasant question. What is your own attitude toward the problem of Gostelradio's monopoly in television?

[Yushyavicius] Monopolies are harmful anywhere. They are harmful in television and radio, too. The lack of a monopoly should not, however, mean a lack of order and especially in the area of television and radio. Already being drafted—indeed already drafted—is the law on the press. I think there should be a separate law on broadcasting; this is the case in most countries, because radio and television have fundamentally different and important issues which need to be dealt with, for example the allocation of frequencies. This is not just a matter for here; it is an international problem as well.

The United States of America, incidentally—which has, I would say, the most competitive infrastructure of television and radio broadcasting—has a Federal Communications Commission, which regulates not only the matter of frequencies but broadcasting principles as well. There is, for example, one principle of great interest to us as well. In a news program, for instance, a journalist does not have the right to express his personal attitude or opinion about a given event. He can recount several opinions. If he does criticize someone—an individual or group of people—he must, within a week, provide a recording of the criticism and give the person criticised time to reply.

[First presenter] All the same, what you are saying relates to news commentators rather than to political observers who should give their own opinion of events.

[Yushkyavicius] You are right; but political observers, as we understand it, do not really exist on foreign television. There are presenters who know how to ask penetrating, sometimes unpleasant, questions of politicians of various colors and in this way the public gains a full picture of a particular political event. I agree with you, however, that a political observer as we in Soviet television understand it, is an interesting figure; and just because they do not exist in this form in others countries does not mean that they should not exist here.

[Second presenter] What is your attitude toward the development of cable television? How does it relate to Gosteleradio, and does Gosteleradio intend to take part in this process which is on the increase?

[Yushkyavicius] Cable television must be developed. The way it is developing at the moment naturally causes alarm, because if we abide strictly by the law, no one apart from Gostelradio should be engaged in television broadcasting.

[Second presenter] Why not?

[Yushkyavicius] Because there is a government decision under which, until there is a new law, Gosteleradio is responsible for television and radio broadcasting in the country, not just for Gosteleradio but in the country. For this reason, it would be possible simply to close the emergent cable television system that is appearing in several towns, but that is the easy way out. I think we should help. Therefore, along with the Ministry of Communications, we are organizing a conference in the next few days to which we have invited cable television organizers. We want to tell them about the legal norms and the technical possibilities there will be and to offer them a list of programs they can use, because they do sometimes use our programs without our permission at the moment and sometimes cut off Central Television programs by interrupting them, which is entirely illegal. [passage omitted on remarks by Yushkyavicius that, despite a career spent in television, he feels it is a secondary medium and that books and the theater take priority.]

Medvedev, Others View Perestroyka

LD2603213190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1630 GMT 23 Mar 90

["Political Dialogues" program; live discussion presented by Viktor Ilich Lyubovtsev; with Vadim Andreyevich Medvedev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Aleksey Mikheyevich Bryachikhin, first secretary of the Sevastopol Rayon Committee in Moscow Ivan Ivanovich Antonovich, pro-rector of the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences; and Boris Alekseyevich Rylkin, secretary of the party committee at the "Banner of Labor" engineering factory in Moscow]

[Excerpts] [Lyubovtsev] Good evening, comrades. Today's edition of Political Dialogue is unusual. It is going out live. This is being done so that you, esteemed comrade viewers, can take a direct part in the discussion on the CPSU Central Committee's draft platform for the

28th party congress. As you know, it was adopted at the party Central Committee February plenum [passage omitted]

Your questions will be answered today by Vadim Andreyevich Medvedev, member of the Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Aleksey Mikheyevich Bryachikhin, first secretary of Sevastopol Raykom, Moscow; Ivan Ivanovich Antonovich, prorector of the Academy of Social Science attached to the CPSU Central Committee; and Boris Alekseyevich Rylkin, secretary of the party committee at the "Banner of Labor" engineering factory in Moscow.

From the list of participants you can see that today we will be trying to study this most important party document from different points of view, from the point of view of both theory and practice, to produce a cross-section, so to speak, of the positions and views of very many communists. I would add that over the last few days—to be more exact, since wednesday [21 March]—dozens of people have called our editorial board on the numbers that were announced over the radio. They have notified us of their questions and shared their views on the draft platform. So, quite a lot of notes have already accumulated, and probably every second or third raises the following question: What is the essence of this document? What goal did the party set itself, when it offered this platform for the 28th congress? [passage omitted] I would ask you, Vadim Andreyevich, to open the discussion.

[Medvedev] Thank you. I think this is a good question with which to start our conversation today. In fact, every party—and our party is not an exception in this respect—is guided in its activities by policy documents and rules. One should bear in mind that the history of the party's current program is quite complex. The final wording was effected by the 27th party congress in 1986. One might think that not a great deal of time had passed since then, only four years. These four years, however, were packed with such important events, changes of such great depth, that we can quite rightly say the program adopted by the 27th party congress no longer accords with current requirements.

One must bear in mind that the 27th party congress was held one year after the April plenum, which proclaimed a new course in party policy. At that time we embarked on the drafting of this new course, the April course, in our policy and did quite a lot to this end. Much was still not visible, however. Many problems could be seen only in outline. Many questions had only just arisen. In this regard, I would like to say that at the party Central Committee March plenum some people complained that the party had moved away from the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress. Some speakers regarded this as almost the main reason for the present difficulties.

How should one view this? We have, of course, moved a long way from the 27th party congress. Have we moved sideways or forward in working out this course? This is the main question. I believe we have moved far ahead. The adoption of the decisions of the January 1987 plenum, which really initiated the reform of our political system, the decisions of the June 1987 plenum, which set out the problems of the economic reform in a comprehensive manner, and, finally, the 19th party conference were indeed major landmarks—turning points, one may say—in the development of restructuring, perestroyka, which marked not only the completion of the drafting of the concept of perestroyka, but also the commencement of its implementation in practice.

In other words, all this gigantic, historic social experience requires interpretation. New questions have arisen. New difficulties have arisen, and we have to find answers to these. Therefore, it is only natural that, as soon as the question of convening the 28th regular congress of our party arose, the problem of a policy document came into the foreground.

Of course the question of drafting a new party program could be raised. I tell you, frankly, that we are not ready for this. We are not ready, not just because we have little time. That is not the point at all. We are not ready because not enough material has been gathered for setting out all the future questions of our development in a manner which is theoretically encompassing, politically significant and clear. Clearly, we should not hurry this along. We came to the conclusion that we should draft an action program, a programme of restructuring for the nearest visible period, and return to the party program later, when the prospects for our development are more clearly outlined and when definite results have been obtained from the practical implementation of perestroyka.

In reaching this conclusion, we considered that the policy document to be adopted by the 28th party congress should be prepared in stages, on a democratic basis. We came to the conclusion that it would be useful to begin the preparation of this document early, long before the 28th congress, to draw up a political platform which would also serve as a basis for a wideranging debate prior to the congress, taking account of the intense polemics underway in society, within the party. We felt the views of communists could be gathered, that the profound stirrings in public awareness which are taking place in our country could be taken into account, and that the content of this document could be enriched, so that the 28th party congress can draw up, on the basis of the political decisions which it takes, a completely edited and molded policy document, which can serve as the basis for our party's practical activities.

In this connection, one should mention that draft CPSU rules are also being prepared. They will be published in literally a few days time, for discussion by the entire people and throughout the party. This will be a good basis for preparations for the 28th party congress.

[Lyubovtsev] Thank you, Vadim Andreyevich. What about the second part of the question? What do you personally believe to be the most fundamentally important, or new, things in this document?

[Medvedev] I think the most fundamentally important and new things in it are its examination and interpretation of problems in the development of the political system and the role of our party. This is the very question which is, I think, agitating the party now, more than anything else. This is the question of the transition to a law-based state, the definition of the party's role and place, the definition of fundamental reforms, so to speak, in intraparty relations, the determination of the forms and methods of work. I think these are the main things, although one should not underestimate the significance of other problems dealt with in the policy document, including economic reform and interethnic relations, as well as the examination of certain general, political, historical, and theoretical problems which are contained in the first section of the program.

The most important things in it, I think, are the building of the party, the determination of the party's role and the forms and methods of its work. [passage omitted]

[Lyubovtsev] Thank you very much. Comrades, we have already begun to receive a large number of questions. I would like to ask the participants in the program to try and answer them as briefly as possible. I must immediately note that there are quite a lot of telephone calls from people making critical remarks about the draft platform. [passage omitted]

[Medvedev] I must say that in the Central Committee we are receiving a huge number of letters and reactions to the published document. Our newspapers are receiving a stream of similar remarks and letters. Some of them are being published, although maybe our press is not yet doing enough of this sort of thing. What can one say? Among these reactions there are, of course, many criticisms of individual sections of the program, the nature of this document, as a whole, and the degree to which various questions have been worked out. I think it would take a very great deal of time to go into these criticisms or even put them into some sort of order.

I would like to talk about the nature of the document. Here there are various criticisms. Comrade Klimenko, for example, believes the platform should be shorter and more specific. Perhaps that is so. In some places it is prolix. I think the main criticism of the platform is along the lines that many problems, including the vision of socialism now held by the party leadership, have been set out in too fragmented a fashion.

Briefly I would like to say that certain difficulties were encountered here in work on the program. The program is, at the end of the day, a program and not a declaration of intentions. It should set out in a meaningful way our views, assessments, and ideas about ways of developing society, ways of resolving tasks. But, at the same time, this is not really a party program, in the full sense of the word. In other words, it is not a document which claims to set out all the problems, ranging from very generalized theoretical approaches as far as specific problems in the economic and social sphere, in interethnic relations, and so on. Therefore, it was necessary here to choose a kind of middle road, to set things out in a way which, through comparatively compact, is sufficiently clear to give our party and society an idea of what future we are calling them to and which tasks we regard as priority ones.

Questions are often asked about who wrote the program, who wrote the platform. I must say it is very difficult to answer this question. I must frankly say that it is impossible to answer this question. The authorship was collective. In the first place, the Central Committee received very many read-made programs, policy documents. There were many variants. They came in from our leading theoretical and ideological institutions, from [word indistinct], from the Academy of Social Sciences, whom Ivan Ivanovich is representing in our conversation today, from the Institute of Social Science, from the Academy of Social Sciences. We commissioned a whole group of scientists, scientists with the most interesting ideas, to pronounce their views either on the overall problem or on individual questions. A colossal amount of material was received and studied by the CPSU Central Committee. Scientists and staff of the CPSU Central Committee worked on this. At the final stage the Politburo and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev put in some very solid work. So, therefore, one can say that the authorship was complex and collective. Therefore, it would probably be a breach of authors' etiquette, so to speak, and copyright to name the authors of the programme, as a whole, or individual sections of it. This is simply impossible.

[Lyubovtsev] At the February plenum an editorial commission even contributed supplementary material.

[Medvedev] Yes, of course. The Central Committee plenum discussed it in very great detail. The editorial commission sat working on it for hours, literally. The full session of the plenum worked directly on the text. So, it really was the fruit of collective efforts. [passage omitted]

[Lyubovtsev] Thank you very much. There are very many questions about those clauses in the draft platform dealing with the rescinding of Article 6 in the Constitution, which has enshrined the CPSU's leading role in society. The question of a multi-party system and political pluralism is raised. This is the subject you have already broached, Aleksey Mikheyevich. [passage omitted] What do you and your comrades think about this, Boris Alekseyevich?

[Rylkin] I was a participant in the February plenum, which adopted the draft platform. I am also familiar with the democratic platform. I must say that the two documents, not in all but in many respects, have the same number of shortcomings and positive features. But I regard the democratic platform as a purely party document, which is not relevant to socioeconomic problems. I dare say this is the case, but I do not wish to comment further on this. I would like to return to what Vadim

Andreyevich said about the collective work done on the draft platform. I would like to say here, as an ordinary communist, as the secretary of a works party organization, that the first draft of the platform left me perplexed. Furthermore, it left me dissatisfied to a certain extent since it does not take account of the views held today by the masses and ordinary communists. I wanted to say this because this view in general coincides with questions which have already been placed on my table today. [passage omitted]

[Medvedev] I would like to say a little about this. One and the same theme has been heard in the answers given by Boris Alekseyevich and Aleksey Mikheyevich, namely, that the draft platform does not answer the questions which really affect the activities of every ordinary communist and, maybe, every primary party organization. This is probably true to a certain extent. The platform deals with general political problems, first and foremost, problems which are of the common significance for the country. Maybe, they have not always been set out in a way which makes it possible to draw direct and immediate conclusions for the practical activities of communists.

I must say that the rules—the draft of the new rules, which will be published—will probably make good this lacuna, so to speak, to a certain extent. I think that in our discussions we should in some way take account of both these documents. Furthermore, I....

[Rylkin, interrupting] Permit me to disagree a bit. I [word indistinct] also. I do not wish to be too sharp, but, in the first place, the rules have still not been published. Second, one should not go on too much about the theory of party documents since the document has already been made available right down to the grass roots, to the primary party organisations. Do you not agree?

[Medvedev] Yes, of course.

[Rylkin] I think that within the plenum we can discuss such things, since the plenum participants are, I would say, very prepared for this sort of thing. I do not deny the masses' ability to think in quite a very serious and informed way, nevertheless, a document which is released for mass discussion should be readable. As Aleksey Mikheyevich rightly said, such a document should be readable, too.

[Medvedev] That is so.

[Rylkin] It should be readable by all sections of society, by party and nonparty people. At the present time nonparty people are watching us more critically than even some communists. Therefore, I believe the complaints are justified.

[Medvedev] Yes, and in fact our theoreticians and workers on the theoretical front, so to speak, are concerned that many problems are insufficiently explained and set out. Here, we must in some way....

[Antonovich] Maybe, as regards the rules, I hope, Viktor Ilich, that you will invite us back to discuss the rules at our next conversation.

[Lyubovtsev] Of course.

[Antonov] [passage omitted: Antonov speaks in detail about the democratic platform. He says all the ideas raised in it could be discussed, accepted or rejected in internal party dialogue. He rejects the idea of the party apologizing for the crimes of Stalin. Two-thirds of today's communists were born after 1945 and it would be unfair to blame them. Such a proposal encourages division within the party and this should be avoided. He says the time for a multi-party system has not yet come. There is still no alternative to the Communist Party]

[Lyubovtsev] Excuse me for interrupting you. You have touched on the important topic of responsibility, the party's historical responsibility, which it is not trying to avoid. There are many questions on this topic. Some letters are very sharply worded. For instance, Timofeyeva writes from Moscow. She says she is a former CPSU member. The party, she says, has brought the country to collapse and ruin. It does not have the right to exist because its ideological concepts are pseudoscientific and utopian. What have you got to say about that, Vadim Andreyevich?

[Medvedev] What can one say, indeed? There are, of course, such sharp views. One can understand the motives for them, bearing in mind the acuteness of the problems and the situation in the country. I do not think we will solve the problems by a wave of heated criticism alone.

So, returning to the democratic platform again, I would say there is also a lot of heated criticism in it. As Boris Alekseyevich has already noted, it has absolutely nothing positive to say about the main problems of our development. Therefore, from my point of view, it would be wrong to compare the two documents, to treat them the same way, as is happening quite often at the moment. The democratic platform only deals with the main questions of internal party affairs.

At the the same time, the references to general political questions are such that, on a number of questions, it is difficult to see what difference there is in the assessment of problems. For instance, the democratic platform talks about the need for all power to be transferred from the party to democratically elected Soviets. Well, who is disputing this? This is a generally known and generally recognized demand. It calls for the acceptance of the concept of democratic socialism. That is exactly what the CPSU's platform advocates.

One gets the impression the authors of the democratic platform feel themselves obliged to find some sort of differences, to put themselves in juxtaposition to the CPSU. These differences are concentrated in the approach to the problems of internal party affairs. Here there are differences. The fundamental difference, which

I regard as unacceptable, is that the democratic platform is demanding freedom for sections within the party; in other words, the freedom to form organizations within the party which have their own structure and discipline. This amounts to parties within the party. This is incompatible with the basic rules and regulations of the CPSU. So, here, it is difficult to find any common ground for an ideological dispute. This organizational question sticks out prominently.

Clearly, the comrades who have grouped themselves around this democratic platform have formed their own coordinating council and are carrying out organizational work. Clearly, they have set themselves the goal of splitting the party. I believe that this aspect of the question is very dangerous and it should not be allowed. On the contrary, what we need to do is to gather all forces, all healthy forces which have an interest in perestroyka, to rally them around certain commonly held ideological positions, to unite them.

If they are opposing or rejecting the fundamental principles on which our party is based, the basic ideological and political foundations—in other words, the choice of socialism, our ideology, the commitment to our teachings which were laid down by Marx, Engels and Lenin, our basic socialist pluralism. We favour the struggle of differnet views, but within a certain framework which is set by the basic ideological, political and organizational foundations of our party. If this is the case, there is no question....

[Lyubovtsev, interrupting] You accept the struggle of different views within the party but not formal, organized....

[Medvedev, interrupting] Yes, the struggle of views within the party, even platforms, that is all Ok. There are other platforms and other documents. They will be published and discussed. It is not a simple question of comparing these two positions. When they talk about organized forms of struggle, however, this is already outside the bounds of the party. This is already incompatible with party ethics and party discipline. [passage omitted: Antonovich argues that critics should write in and offer their suggestions, if they are not satisfied. He criticizes the democratic platform for its negative attitude. Bryachikhin reiterates that the party document must be understandable by everyone. Bryachikhin and Antonovich debate various points between themselves. Rylkin answers a question about attitude toward young people]

[Lyubovtsev] Good. I ought to mention that the largest number of letters, notes and questions are, not unnaturally, addressed to Vadim Andreyevich Medvedev. This is understandable. It is not every day that a member of the Politburo who is also a CPSU Central Committee secretary speaks on a live program. I would ask you, esteemed viewers, to ask questions of the other members of our panel, as well. Vadim Andreyevich, the CPSU has now given approval for a multi-party system. Under this system will the CPSU give up its powers peacefully or will it fight for power? That is a question from Petr Portugalov, a Muscovite.

[Medvedev] Well, our party has voluntarily renounced the monopoly on power which it is currently guaranteed in legislative form. I believe this is one of the principal landmarks in the transition to a modern, civilized, and democratic society and democratic state. The process of demarcating functions and the hand-over of real power is underway. This process is still in its initial stage, but it will be further developed. I am sure it will be completed. In other words, we will come to the type of society where, as a result of the competition of ideas, platforms, positions and political groups the people will choose the programs and political courses that most fully express its requirements and interests.

Alongside other social movements and political trends the party will wage this struggle for support, to win support for its policy, to win a mandate to govern the country. So, the party does not intend to give up without a struggle, as they say, to give up its role as the ruling party. This will be a democratic struggle, however. It is a struggle that will observe all the principles of a democratic state, with free comparison of views, ideas and positions. We have a scientifically drafted policy. When we offer it to the people, we can conduct a regular dialogue with the people and with other social forces. Therefore, I am confident we have every chance of successfully campaigning for the retention and consolidation of our role as the ruling party, while strictly observing all the laws and unswervingly following even the present wording of Articles 6 and 7, which state that the party operates within the law and uses democratic methods. [passage omitted] I must say, in confirmation of the dialogue or the development of the dialogue which has taken place here, that opinion polls do indeed show that at the present time the broad masses of the working people really do regard the party as still being the fundamental force which is capable of ending the crisis in the country. Here I am answering a question I have received from (Comrade Leonid Iosifovich Libel) in Moscow. The party has indeed shouldered responsibility for the situation in which the country found itself. It does not renounce this responsibility and is fully determined to get the country out of the situation. As opinion polls show, the platform which has been prepared for the congress and which we are discussing today, has, in general, received more positive responses than negative ones amongst the general public and the broad masses of the people.

[Lyubovtsev] That is obvious even from the notes which are receiving today.

[Medvedev] Yes. The Academy of Social Science has, you know, carried out such a sounding of public opinion. It showed that 66 percent of those questioned, and they came from quite a wide range of people, were in favor. It is interesting that their reaction was more favorable than that of the party officials who offered expert advice. So, party officials are more critical of the program than ordinary people, and this is also borne out by today's dialogue and questions.

[Lyubovtsev] Yes.

[Medvedev] They are more critical. Nevertheless, we should not play down, so to speak, the significance of criticism. We should not rely on the fact that the majority support it. No. We must of course continue our work. [passage omitted]

[Bryachikhin] Boris Alekseyevich, I would like to add something. What I would like to know is, who abolished the practice of having party groups in nonparty organizations? The rules exist, Vadim Andreyevich. Why do we not have a party group within the Congress of People's Deputies? If there is one, who is responsible for it? Who is carrying out the party line at the Supreme Soviet session and the Congress of People's Deputies? This is written into the rules, but it is not being done.

[Medvedev] Yes. This is a big problem in its own right, you know.

[Bryachikhin] But we do it in the rayons, Vadim Andreyevich.

[Medvedev] Among the USSR People's Deputies 86 percent are communists.

[Lyubovtsev] The overwhelming majority.

[Medvedev] If a party group of deputies were to be asembled prior to the sessions and prior to the adoption of decisions, what would there be left for the Congress of People's Deputies to do? [passage omitted]

[Antonovich] Viktor Ilich, I hear the voice of the one-party state speaking! In a civil society the party fights to get its members into all democratic institutions. The party itself does not wield power. Its function is to influence society through its ideas and its members. In this connection, I believe future developments will make it impossible for there to be party groups in democratic institutions. [passage omitted] Comrades, party members who belong to such institutions must swear loyalty to their profession first and then to their party. Otherwise, the civil society will not function. This is a very delicate question. Party groups should not be created. Party groups should be confined to party offices and kept out of the civil society and out of its institutions. That is what I think.

[Medvedev] It is difficult to agree with that, Ivan Ivanovich. Where the party group operates is not the point. That is not the point. In general, I think the existence of party groups will be (?authorized). They will become more important....

[Bryachikhin, interrupting] ...And more incisive.

[Medvedev] And more incisive. What I meant, when speaking of the current situation, was that preliminary discussion at the party group of questions facing the Congress of People's Deputies or the Supreme Soviet would imply, haphazardly, a disparagement of that body. That is the present situation. However, I do not rule out, on the contrary I consider it essential, preliminary discussion of a kind of political line among the communists, where certain cardinal questions are concerned. Where the solution of specific issues is concerned, however, it seems to me we should grant more freedom of action, more autonomy to party members. Party discipline should not dictate every practical step that they take.

[Antonovich] No, Vadim Andreyevich, viewer Maksimov is absolutely right. Since a multi-party system has not yet come into being, conditions are for the time being quite OK.

[Medvedev] Yes.

[Antonovich] Imagine what will happen when we have many parties. If we have 15 parties in our Supreme Soviet, there will be 15 party groups. They will tear the Supreme Soviet apart. Why do I say this? This is a very delicate question. So long as we do not have more than one party, our society will not have socially antagonistic and diametrically opposed classes. As you know, bourgeois parties all pursue their own goals and vote along party lines. I do not think our parliament will vote along party lines. It will vote in accordance with its professional evaluation of the problems. In this sense, if we have a multi-party system, party groups will make business impossible. They will block it. That is a great danger.

[Medvedev] Well, we will see what happens.

[Lyubovtsev] Esteemed participants in the program, we have digressed a bit from the questions which we are receiving from viewers. There are very many questions, some of them quite angry and sharply worded, about the pay rises to party and state employees. [passage omitted: one such letter summarized. Bryachikhin answers the question, noting that party workers received a much needed pay rise in October last year. He notes that as first secretary of a rayon with 300,000 inhabitants his salary was only R390 a month. Now it is R600. However, he says the timing of the pay rise, on the eve of the elections, was unfortunate. Rylkin agrees with Bryachikhin that the party earned a lot of criticism by raising party pay at such a sensitive time, although the pay rise itself was justified. Antonovich says the public are angry not so much about the pay rise, but the fact that the quality of work done has not improved. Antonovich and Bryachihin discuss the issue between them]

[Medvedev] Maybe the dialogue between those two participants in our conversation will continue, but I would like to note that up until October last year we in the party Central Committee were subjected to colossal pressure over the question of raising the pay of party workers. From the state apparatus there was also great pressure to raise the pay of state and administrative workers, so that it keeps pace with changing economic circumstances. After all, there is nothing so unusual about this. From time to time salaries are increased because of changing economic conditions. For a long time we had postponed, so to speak, the implementation of the pay increase, thinking that maybe we should try and choose a time when such a pay rise would not lead to a negative reaction of some kind. It is difficult now to judge how opportune or inopportune a moment was chosen.

But when we took the decision to increase pay, the party Central Committee came under still stronger pressure, this time from people protesting about the pay rise. The mass media added to the pressure as well; everywhere people made their views known. I think a certain contradictoriness, so to speak, in the development of public opinion is apparent here. This is something like a no-win situation: No matter what you do, you get criticized. So, we had to choose a decision that would meet requirements, a necessary decision, but also to risk psychological losses, so to speak.

[Lyubovtsev] Thank you, Vadim Andreyevich.

[Medvedev] I do not think this decision should have been rescinded or reversed in some way.

[Unidentified speaker] No, no, no.

[Medvedev] It was fundamentally necessary and correct.

[Lyubovtsev] Thank you.

[Medvedev] It was simply necessary to explain to the public and ....

[Lyubovtsev, interrupting] I think that even if not everybody is satisified by your answers, at any rate you have frankly explained the situation. That is very important. Now, we have very many questions about the name of the party, the name CPSU. There are dozens of questions, literally. [passage omitted]

[Medvedev] I would like to comment on this. There a number of notes here. For example, (Comrade Yevronin) has drawn attention to the fact that the word communism is not once mentioned in the platform. Have you renounced communism or not, he asks. What is your attitude toward communism? There is another question from (Comrade Vosich) who lives at the settlement of Lyakhovichi in Brest Oblast.

On the whole, I agree with what Ivan Ivanovich said about this. I think that if one takes a very broad view of the question, we have no reason to abandon in some way the communist perspective. We regard it as the general aim of our development, as a kind of ideal, even as a set of moral values, as the tradition of our teaching, founded by Marx and Engels. This idea goes far back into history, into the history of the teaching of the utopian socialists. This idea has been consolidated in practice by the historical experience of society's development in the 19th and 20th centuries.

Therefore, I believe our policy documents should not avoid the concept of the communist perspective. I think the policy document would not suffer if such a mention was included in it. This regards not only the policy document, but also the new rules of our party. This is determined by the experience of retaining the party's present name. I would also subscribe to the idea that there is something very symbolic and psychologically important about this. The preservation of our tradition is important. We are not renouncing the best manifestations of our tradition. Although we are purging ourselves of all the distortions of our teaching and our values and freeing ourselves from all the negative phenomena and crimes associated with the Stalin era, we are still the heirs to the best traditions in our history, the best in our teaching. If we apply it to contemporary conditions, we will, I think, succeed in creating the basis for the consolidation of our communists and party members. We are trying to combine the experience and tradition gathered from the past, the experience of the older generations, with our young people's fresh perception of contemporary processes.

I would be in favor of retaining the name of our party, as it has developed in history, since the time of Vladimr Ilich Lenin, and I would also vote for it.

[Lyubovtsev] Thank you, Vadim Andreyevich. As you would expect, many viewers who have rung us are asking about the situation in Lithuania, no doubt the most topical problem facing us today. There is a question for you, Vadim Andreyevich. How do you assess the actions of the Lithuanian communists in disassociating themselves from the USSR? [passage omitted]

[Medvedev] I think this can be divided into two parts. One deals fundamentally with our approach to the demand, to the idea, to the constitutional position, to the right to self-determination, going as far as secession, and the other with the situation in Lithuania. I think we must take a principled attitude toward all questions, above all toward the very complex and sensitive nationalities question, principled in the sense that we must recognize the democratic rights of the peoples. We must follow our tradition in this respect.

Incidentally Lenin's dictum about the right of nations to self- determination, going as far as secession, was consigned to oblivion or at any rate relegated to the background for some time. This is no coincidence. Unitarian tendencies held sway or dominated our nationalities policy for several decades. The line followed by the present party leadership, by the party's Central Committee, is based on the view that Lenin's policy on the nations' right to self-determination and even secession should be fully reinstated.

This is the sole prerequisite, an absolutely essential prerequisite for a democratic solution of ethnic problems. Therefore, the principle was fully reasserted, confirmed, and developed in both the platform and the decisions of the September 1989 plenum of the Central Committee.

But, on the other hand, the principle of national self-determination, going as far as secession, certainly does not mean that in all cases one must support any separatist tendency. On the contrary self-determination implies there are different ways in which the nation and the state can be built. Secession is merely the ultimate form in which this can manifest itself. Any decision on the expedience of such a secession must take account of all the factors, including economic, political, cultural, and spiritual integration, and so on and so forth. It must take account of the combined interests of every people, the peoples of the entire Soviet Union—our international interests, in other words, the entire set of conditions.

So, why is one obliged to make a negative assessment of the actions of the present Lithuanian leadership? Basically, they have tried and are trying to solve this question in an intransigent fashion, by taking unilateral decisions on questions that affect the interests of everybody, the interests of the entire union. We are categorically opposed to this. We fundamentally agree the peoples that have historically formed part of the union should continue to develop the entire system of relations between nations and ethnic groups. We are opposed, however, to the imposition of unilateral decisions by anybody, especially since Lithuania, in common with other republics, is inhabited by people of different nationalities. This cannot be overlooked either. The rights of man should be valued more highly than the rights of nations. This is a generally recognized principle, so to speak, of international law.

So, that is how I would basically approach this question. I do not think the omission of this clause, about the right of nations to self-determination and even secession, from our documents could have, so to speak....

[Lyubovtsev, interrupting] Of course.

[Medvedev] ...Forestall the development of the Lithuanian events.

[Lyubovtsev] You cannot make a straight connection between cause and effect.

[Medvedev] On the contrary, if we were to ignore this right, to exclude it from our political and constitutional documents, it would further complicate interethnic relations.

[Lyubovtsev] Thank you, Vadim Andreyevich. [passage omitted] Ivan Ivanovich, I wish to warn you that, unfortunately, our program is inexorably drawing to a close. Only four minutes remain. So, I would like each participant to speak very briefly about one or, at the most, two of the most interesting questions which now lie in front of you. [passage omitted: Antonovich answers a question about the transfer of power between the party and the soviets. He says no one will hand any power to the soviets if they do not take it themselves. The soviets must exercise their constitutional prerogative. He says the events in Lithuania are alarming. All separatism is harmful, he asserts. People should be learning to cooperate with one another. Bryachikhin, in his turn, says communication between ordinary communists and the Central Committee should be more direct] Very many questioners accuse me, as the chairman, of not inviting opposition representatives. Why are there no representatives of the democratic platform, for example, and so on? Comrade Kristallev, a retired colonel from Moscow, who has belonged to the party since 1955, suggests that Central Television stage a debate on the CPSU platform between a variety of participants, including representatives of the coordinating council of the democratic platform, the conference of party clubs, the CPSU, other groups, and so on. At the moment I am not authorised by the Gosteleradio leadership to say yes immediately to all these ideas. I think they are quite acceptable and could be used in future, however. [passage omitted: Lyubovtsev says that a live TV debate on the draft CPSU rules will be staged in early April]

Now I would ask you, Vadim Andreyevich, briefly to sum up our conversation and, maybe, answer just one question because our time is already running out.

[Medvedev] A number of queries and questions about ideological work have been received. For example, Comrade Gennadiy Vladimirovich Serebrennyy from Moscow asks why it is that Central Committee secretaries responsible for ideology, including the esteemed Vadim Andreyevich Medvedev, only find words to explain the reasons for complex situations after such situations have arisen. Well, I think that is a positive assessment of the work done, because Comrade Serebrennyy does actually say that the words did explain the reasons for the situation. I would not even say that. Maybe, our work is still inadequate in this area, too, not to mention the suggestion that we ought to carry out some kind of preemptive ideological work. [passage omitted]

Nongovernment Human Rights Commission Sought

LD1703052290 Moscow World Service in English 2200 GMT 16 Mar 90

[Text] A meeting has been called in Moscow by a support group for setting up a nongovernment committee for human rights and international cooperation in humanitarian issues. The meeting involved local human rights activists, members of parliament, intellectuals, and religious leaders. Draft papers were presented for discussion in the run-up to a founding conference.

MVD Proposes Law To Protect Militiamen

LD1403153890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1404 GMT 13 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, 13 Mar (TASS)—A draft USSR law aimed at providing better legal protection for staff of law enforcement bodies at a time when the country is experiencing a dramatic increase in crime has been submitted for consideration by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The draft law "On Liability for Law Infringements in Respect of Persons Performing Official Obligations or Public Duty to Protect Public Order and the Rights of Citizens" has been drawn up by the ministries of Internal Affairs and of Justice in conjunction with the Procuracy, the KGB, and the USSR Supreme Court.

It was stated at a briefing today in the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs that this step has been taken because of the increasing frequency of offenses against the life and health of militia staff, and of resistance to them, including armed resistance. Last year alone 347 members of the law enforcement bodies were killed.

The draft law envisions, among other things, the establishment of criminal responsibility for attacking people who are taking part in the maintainence of public order or defending the rights of citizens, as well as an increase in liability for resisting, insulting, or threatening such persons. In addition to militia staff, the law is designed to provide protection for judges, procurators, and investigators.

It envisions strengthening administrative liability for failing to comply with the legitimate demands of persons maintaining public order and defending the rights of citizens, as well as for calls to disobey or hinder these activities.

In the opinion of the leadership of the law enforcement bodies, adopting this law would not only facilitate an increase in the confidence of their staff that their rights and interests are reliably defended, but would also create more favorable conditions for maintaining law and order and combatting crime.

Anarchist Details Views, Goals of Group

90UN1125A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 9, 3-9 Mar 90 p 8

[Article by P. Ryabov, representative of the Moscow organization of the Confederation of Anarcho-Syndicalists, under the rubric: "At the Editorial Office 12,216 Questions Have Arrived in the Last Week"]

[Text] **Judging by the mail, our readers are interested in articles on the ideological systems of informal groups.**

Today P. Ryabov, representative of the Moscow organization of the Confederation of Anarcho-Syndicalists (KAS), continues this series.

The editor reminds the readers that the programs which are published do not necessarily reflect the point of view of ARGUMENTY I FAKTY.

Anarchism as a fully realized theory has existed since the beginning of the 19th century. Since then many scholars and workers, peasants and students, and sailors and religious figures in the most varied countries of the world have raised its black banner. From the times of the great French Revolution, the color black has been the symbol of freedom. The weavers of Lyon, for instance, fought under a black banner in the 1830's. It would also be appropriate to recall that the workers executed in Chicago, who are commemorated every year on the Day of International Solidarity of Workers, were also anarchists. Such different people as P.J. Proudhon and N.I. Makhno, L.N. Tolstoy and M.A. Bakunin, and P.A. Kropotkin and Mahatma Gandhi were anarchists, united by love of freedom and respect for human dignity.

There are many currents in anarchism: anarcho-communism, anarcho-individualism, anarcho-syndicalism, etc. The KAS existed in our country from the beginning of the century until it was destroyed by the organs of the NKVD [People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs] at the end of the twenties. The creation of the KAS was declared on 1-2 May 1989 at a constituent congress in Moscow. Today the KAS includes groups and organizations in 30 of the country's cities.

Anarchy is not chaos but rather a harmonious society of free individuals. Anarchism is an ethical, philosophical, and political teaching about the constant struggle to free the individual from the chains of force, oppression, exploitation, and government. We compare the principle of state centralism, where an all-powerful central authority dictates to people, labor collectives, and oblasts who have no rights how they are to live and work, to the ideas of decentralization, self-management, and federalism, whereby all power is concentrated at the bottom. The resolution of these problems, in our opinion, occurs only through the demilitarization of life, a transition from technocratic to ecological consciousness, decentralization, and replacement of bulky, self-contained states with free federations of labor collectives and oblasts.

Even now it is possible to remove the state from the sphere of culture and to eliminate the centralized parasites—the ministries—and replace them with banks of information on a system of economic accountability. We need to introduce juries, abolish the death penalty, federalize the system of government, turn enterprises over to the ownership of the labor collectives, etc.

The KAS has no party discipline or ruling central organs. The KAS has the character of a movement and is an open organization in an informational sense.

The individual groups in the various cities function autonomously and are united only by the community of ideas stated in the program of the KAS and by specific joint activities.

The social makeup of the KAS is varied: There are students and pensioners, workers and engineers, and teachers and scholars (the KAS numbers about 500 activists in all). Among our publications there are some that are well known in "informal" channels, such as OBSHCHINA, VOLYA, ZDRAVYY SMYSL (Moscow), NABAT (Kharkov), and others. Of course in our activities we categorically repudiate violent methods and we study the tactics of Gandhiism (acts of civil disobedience and nonviolent struggle).

Speaking as adherents of stateless socialism, we fully support the words of M. Bakunin: "Freedom without socialism is privilege and injustice! Socialism without freedom is slavery and bestiality!"

Customs Council To Expand International Cooperation

LD1403141790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1100 GMT 13 Mar 90

[By TASS correspondent Lev Frolov]

[Text] Leningrad, 13 mar (TASS)—The Soviet Union has adopted a decision to become a member of the Council of Customs Cooperation, an international organization which unites 95 states. This was announced by Vitaliy Boyarov, head of the Main Directorate of the State Customs Control of the USSR Council of Ministers, at a representative meeting of the customs establishments of the northwest of the USSR which took place in Leningrad.

The restructuring of foreign economic activity, the invigoration of international links and the new, considerably simplified emigration rules have breached the peculiar "barrier of seclusion" that has been a specific feature of the work of this service in past decades, Boyarov noted. Now the Soviet side is moving toward an in-depth cooperation with similar foreign services.

In particular, the soviet Customs authorities intend to take part in a major business deal in exporting Soviet textiles to CEMA countries by simplifying the checking procedure for passing goods across the border. Substantial corrections aimed at easing the regulations will be introduced in the operation of motor car crossings at the USSR western border. The draft envisions the participation of Yugoslav firms in fitting out these points, the first of which are being installed in Chop (Ukraine) and Grodno (Belorussia).

Moscow Center To Monitor Political Trends

PM1403085990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 3

[S. Mostovshchikov report: "Independent Political Scientists' Center"]

[Text] Moscow—A Center for Political and Legal Studies and Information has opened in Moscow on Roshdestvenka Street at No. 19/10. This organization has three founders—the cultural center of the newspaper MOSCOW NEWS, the "Postfactum" information agency, and the "Yuridicheskaya Literatura" Publishing House's "Yustitsiya" [Justice] legal service.

The head of the center is Candidate of Juridical Sciences Nina Belyayeva. She is planning to organize scientific research on the level of legal awareness and political activeness in Soviet society. This is to consist in gathering information about formal and informal social organizations and analyzing it professionally, and conducting original sociological studies.

According to Nina Belyayeva, we do not have an overall picture of the deployment of political forces in society, nor do we have a complete idea about what political forces exist in our society in general. Belyayeva believes that her center could serve as the basis for the establishment of economically accountable political science which, for the first time, would move on from general deliberations to the implementation of specific orders.

The center is publishing a weekly bulletin, VYBORY-90, which contains specific and rather interesting information about the ups and downs of the current election campaign. The bulletin publishes unique sociological data on sociological opinion polls carried out among the candidates that have already been registered. From this it is possible to learn about their attitude to communism, private ownership of land and enterprises, a number of political organizations, and individual leaders....

The center also engages in purely charitable activities. It is possible to obtain free advice and consultation with major specialists on where and from whom to expect "dirty tricks" during the election campaign, how to compile a candidate's program, how to communicate with voters, and even how to dress in order to make a good impression on an audience.

Jewish Development Zone in Far East Considered

OW2603095190 Tokyo KYODO in English 0908 GMT 26 Mar 90

[Text] Kyoto, March 26 KYODO—A leading Soviet scientist said Monday plans are under consideration to establish a region open to the free personal, material, and technological exchange, and investment of Jews throughout the world in the Soviet Far East.

Pavel A. Minakir, head of the Institute of Regional Systems Studies, said he plans to have a proposal ready by the end of the year to present to Moscow to promote domestic and foreign investment in the development of the Soviet Union's easternmost expanses. Minakir, here to attend the Japan-Soviet scientific exchange symposium, said Japanese cooperation in the project is indispensible to realize the project considered vital to the development of the area.

The development region, explained Minakir, will be located 150 kilometers west of Khabarovsk in the city of

Birobidzhan with a population of 220,000, including 12,000 Jewish residents. He said freedom and autonomy as enjoyed in the West would be granted to the development zone with the hope of making the Soviet Far East the leader in technological development while halting the brain drain rooted in the emigration of 100,000 Soviet Jews annually.

The institute, only recently established in Birobidzhan, plans to set up international science centers in the coming years in connection with the institute's areas of research, education, technology, economics, and ecology, according to Minakir.

In addition to inviting leading Jewish research scholars from the Soviet Union and Europe to the institute, a special economic zone open to free domestic and foreign investment is being planned for the city. The economic zone would set up a special tax structure and hospitable measures to encourage the investment of Western capital and the yen, said Minakir, with hopes of making the zone an exporter of high technology goods.

Minakir called the proposal for the development zone a touchstone to see how serious the central government is about the development of the Far East and the autonomy of the Jews.

Academician Discusses Shortages, Rationing

LD2203161490 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 11, 18 Mar 90 p 10

[Interview with Academician Tatyana Zaslavskaya by Vladimir Gurevich: "Ration Cards: Stopgap or Deadlock?"—date, place not given; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] The government has rejected the idea of general rationing, but in practice fewer and fewer foodstuffs and consumer goods are sold freely. This was the subject of a recent talk with Academician Tatyana Zaslavskaya, director of the All-Union Centre for the Study of Public Opinion.

MN: General rationing went into effect during war communism, collectivization and the war. Now we are again close to reintroducting ration cards everyhwere. But by stripping the shops bare, we are questioning the very idea of the reform: Its aim is to move away from administrative distribution, but empty counters cause many people to "vote for" ration cards as the lesser evil.

T.Z.: People are tired and one can understand them. But public opinion, as polls show, is not as simple. Asked how they would respond to ration cards and coupons given a food shortage, 50.7 per cent of the people polled said "positively", and 34.4 per cent said "negatively". But when asked how general food rationing would influence their life, only 25 per cent said "positively", while 46 per cent said "negatively".

MN: Who favours the ration system?

T.Z.: Of those who favour it, 29 per cent do not work (pensioners and housewives) and are thus removed from departmental sources of distribution and want to get the products they need at least with ration cards. The remaining 71 per cent are workers with low incomes, residents of small towns and settlements who get only the most inadequate food supplies. They too, want justice.

MN: Given ration cards, everyone would get their fair share... Thus, it is a more serious and no doubt more attractive proposal than the simple idea of universal fraternity. Instead of the existing arbitrary and unjust system of distribution, a more civilized system is needed, guaranteeing a firm and equal minimum of supplies. The rest of the goods should be placed at the disposal of the economy and the market: if producers feel an interest, they will increase that part, the market will come into balance and it will be possible to discontinue the rationing... But still, a "fair" rationing is doubtful. There will be another but again unjust system and, what's more, all our efforts will go into the organization of distribution - we adore this - rather than the main thing which is establishing a market. I am afriad that the apparat will grab happily at the bureaucratic elements of the proposed system, and discard its market part.

T.Z.: I also have my doubts about the sense of introducing cards for everyone. The same card for a one-year-old as for a grown man? The same quota of meat (mutton, pork) for a Moslem as for a Russian? In fact, in the past ration cards were always differentiated according to demographic as well as professional groups. But without the rationing, I think, it will be difficult to manage. Of course, 45 years after the war it will be psychologically complicated to agree to this. But what can be done? The economic reform will create an inflation spiral and this must be reckoned with. No index of prices and incomes, however necessary, will keep pace with such inflation - let's face facts. But the ration cards will allow people to buy products at fixed prices. And the amount of products rationed could be considerably (2-3 times) more than during the postwar years, so that hunger will be out of the questions. Commercial prices would naturally soar, but everyone would be guaranteed a stable minimum of products at reasonable prices. This would also be a gain for small towns with virtually no food available at state prices.

MN: They have no food because the Centre can take that food away at its own discretion. As before, local supplies depend upon the "authority" of the local leaders and on how they distribute them. Unless we adopt a tax in kind, this will continue endlessly... But it seems to me that the minuses of the rationing system will exceed any pluses. There are no guarantees that everyone will receive what he needs. Whereas the guarantee of a growing "black market" is indisputable. It is impossible to control ration cards for the entire population. It could be good if we managed to see that they were distributed to as many sick and handicapped people as possible.

T.Z.: Why? during the war and the first postwar years, a universal rationing existed and control was rather strict. Although numerous shortcomings are inevitable: partially unused cards, substitution for some products with others, low-quality goods, the huge distribution and control apparatus, corruption and profiteering with ration cards, falsified cards, redistribution of goods by consumers. During the war my father got cards for alcohol and cigarettes, but he neither drank, nor smoked. So we sold them and then bought sugar and bread. Today we have the same problem: we needed winter boots for our daughter, but nothing was available in the shops, then we got an invitation for a special, closed sale. There were no suitable boots, but there were fur hats. People advised me to buy one and I thought: I don't need it now, but when I do need one, I won't be able to find anything, so I bought it... Of course, this way of organizing trade is not normal. On the other hand, given a rationing system, one may find more effective ways.

MN: For example?

T.Z.: Provide people not with cards with a fixed amount of meat, milk, groats and so on, but with special books of "money" coupons - say 60 or 80 roubles - that may be used to buy things only in certain shops where one would be able to choose, rather than having to buy what is not needed. This will also reduce the distribution apparatus. A third possibility would be to introduce, in addition to our ordinary rouble, a hard rouble, and pay a part of people's wages, pensions and allowances in hard roubles which can be spent to buy goods at shops with a better selection of products.

MN: Can we guarantee the necessary amount of goods against ration cards? How much meat should be guaranteed per person per year? Won't we have to divide meat between regions and won't these cheap cards end by causing costly new inter-ethnic conflicts?

T.Z.: Nobody has yet considered how much of what should be on each card, or where these products will come from. In fact, the countrywide rationing has been rejected. Though at the local level, it already exists de facto. Miners received less soap for their coupons than other people although given their profession they should have gotten more. The central economic bodies are simply avoiding this problem, and this is even worse than an official rationing. How inevitable is it? How much longer can it be avoided? It depends on the market. Had we somewhat satisfied the market... But we don't even have a market as yet; only the shortages are increasing which makes people want ration cards.

MN: "Ration cards but not a reform!" But without reform, there will be fewer and fewer goods for each card. On the other hand, reform will mean tackling the most sensitive issues—such as prices.

T.Z.: The issue of reform was raised over three years ago when the shortage and other imbalances were not felt so acutely. But public opinion strongly opposed it. Today it will be much more complicated to put it through. Although people do not reject price reform out of hand. A year ago the polls showed that three people opposed reform for every one person who supported it and the fifth person was undecided (20 per cent). Now 37 per cent are undecided and there are twice as many supporters as opponents.

MN: There are probably also more people ready for radical steps to speed up the reform.

T.Z.: Public opinion is almost contradictory... Take ration cards: many people are for them, but ultimately very few like them. In 1947 the abolition of rationing and the ability to go to a shop and freely buy something excited great enthusiasm. It was a real holiday, although the end of rationing was accompanied by a sharp rise in prices. People took it rather quietly.

MN: But it was not accompanied by an economic reform. The system that created shortages and ration cards remained and now we find ourselves in a new deadlock. I think there is a real danger that the distribution inclinations may prove stronger than the reform impulses. Cities and regions are being transferred to coupons one after another, new administrative and trade barriers are being introduced and all this without any "consultings with the people". On the other hand, the adoption of laws, necessary for the radicalization of the reform, is being postponed because, as they say, we must consult the people first. But by the time the 2nd Congress of USSR People's Deputies opened, the results of the poll on ownership were already available. But the deputies did not see them.

T.Z.: Unfortunately, this is true. Nevertheless, people's deputies show great interest in public opinion polls. The executive bodies are less interested: they distrust the quality of our information, especially when it disagrees with their own preconceptions. This is what happened, say, with the poll on ownership. The poll showed that many people favour private property (which surprised me, too). Recently we conducted another poll on ownership among a broader sample of the population and the results were more or less the same. Twice as many people favour private property as do not. Though not all supporters agree about the hiring of labour to work at private enterprises, or the transfer of big plants to private owners.

MN: Polls aren't referendums. But they are much better indicators than the "nationwide discussions". But can radical reforms be conducted through a referendum? Lenin carried out NEP without "polls", although it was a radical shift in policy and ran counter to the sentiments of many people.

T.Z.: Naturally, reform cannot change course according to the results of each new poll. But the "scissors" between current policy and the prevailing public opinion can be slid apart only to some degree. Then, the question on the correction of the course is posed or the reforms begin to bear fruit and thus find support.

Writers' Union Welcomes New Draft Statutes

PM2003162390 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 17 Mar 90 Single Edition p 4

[Report by unidentified TASS correspondent: "What Sort of Writers' Union?"]

[Text] The draft of the new edition of the USSR Writers' Union statutes and the question of convening the ninth congress of the country's writers were on the agenda of a plenum of this creative organization's board. It was held 16 March in Moscow.

The past five years have been a time for breaking stereotypes in all spheres, noted V.V. Karpov, first secretary of the USSR Writers' Union Board. A new social climate has been created in the country, and new interrepublic and interethnic relations have begun to take shape. Much of what has been included in the proposed draft statutes is a direct consequence of these processes. The future Writers' Union is seen as a federation of equal and independent writers' unions, as a social organization whose basic task is to defend our main social gains—democracy and glasnost. It must be a union of equals, uniting people with different views, convictions, tastes, and styles, and with the right of each person to creative self-expression.

The plenum participants, among whom were representatives of all the republics' writers' organizations, came to the conclusion that the new edition of the statutes satisifes in principle the basic demands of a free democratic association of writers. It offers the opportunity for demonstrating creative initiative; and in the legal context it ensures the status and rights of the writer in society. It was decided to continue work on the draft and to publish it before the next—the ninth—congress of the country's writers. It was decided to convene it in the second quarter of 1991.

A resolution was adopted which says that in recent years an oppressive atmosphere of group struggle has flared up in a number of the country's writers' organizations which threatens to lead to the creative union's self-destruction. It is also having an effect on all society. The plenum participants regard the critical deterioration of the moral atmosphere in the creative organization as the main danger threatening Soviet literature. In their opinion, the new statutes must contain norms in accordance with which the Writers' Union can protect not only literary figures' social rights but the honor and dignity of each one of them.

PEN Centers To Publish Newspaper, Magazine

LD2203195790 Moscow TASS in English 1825 GMT 22 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 22 TASS—A new magazine that will be published four times a year will describe the activities of Soviet PEN centres, Anatoliy Rybakov, a prominent writer and president of the Russian PEN centre, told TASS.

It is also planned to publish a newspaper and to establish an agency for the sale of Soviet authors' books abroad, he said.

Before last year Soviet authors were not members of the International PEN Club. Many Soviet writers regarded this as voluntary isolation from the world literary process. Perestroika and glasnost have made it possible to bridge the gap in the development of creative contacts and mutual cultural enrichment.

PEN centres have sprung up in Moscow, Kiev and the capitals of three Baltic republics and are in the making in Belorussia, Central Asia and Armenia.

The activities of Soviet PEN centres are carried out in accordance with their statutes based on the charter of the International PEN Club.

In February this year the Soviet Government granted Soviet PEN centres the right to conclude contracts for publishing abroad literary works by authors who are members of Soviet PEN centres and to collect commission fee from authorship dues in foreign currency.

Committee Appeals for Lenin Birthday Subbotnik

PM2103131790 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 20 Mar 90 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Subbotnik To Mark the Lenin Jubilee"]

[Text] The "Surgutneftegaz" production association trade union committee has addressed an appeal to all the working people associated in the country's trade unions to hold a trade union subbotnik 21 April to mark the 120th anniversary of the birth of V.I. Lenin.

In conditions of the rapidly changing sociopolitical situation in the country, the shaken prestige of traditional structures, and the predominance of "rally-type" reasoning, certain forces are trying to call into question the feasibility of building socialism in the country and to wipe out the significance of Lenin's ideological and theoretical heritage.

On the eve of the 120th anniversary of Lenin's birth, the document notes, it is necessary to state with utmost emphasis that Soviet trade unions have always regarded and regard Vladimir Ilich as a great thinker and revolutionary whose whole life and work were inseparably linked with the protection of the working people's rights and interests. The upcoming anniversary is not an occasion for organizing pompous events, but at the same time it is not a pretext either for renouncing the ideas which he put forward, the socialist path of development, or, ultimately, the assiduous remembrance of this fighter for the working people's rights and interests.

The subbotnik's initiators are proposing that the money it earns be transferred to trade union accounts to help resolve urgent problems of the working people, their families, and war and labor veterans and to fund charitable aid to refugees, poor and low-income families, orphans, and the disabled.

Kaluga DOSAAF Plan To Sell MIGs Debunked

PM1103136690 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 20 Mar 90 p 4

[O. Khvastunova report: "We Only Have MiG's—But Without Knowledge and Commercial Skill, Even the Most Promising Deal Ends in Embarrassment"]

[Text] Kaluga—One fine spring morning, to be precise, 1 March this year, Sergey Dyakonov, director of a youth center, woke up to find himself famous throughout his native Kaluga Oblast.

Two days later the whole country knew of him. The notorious "ANT" apparently had successors—Dyakonov and his deputy, Sergey Larin. The story of how the Kaluga youth center of the Komsomol's [All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League] Leninskiy Raykom [rayon committee] tried to sell military aircraft abroad spread from the local newspapers to the central papers.

When I arrived in Kaluga the local authorities were no longer in a state of shock and there were virtually no remaining gaps in the story. Conclusions had been drawn and findings written up. Dozens of people, abandoning all their other work, were checking the newspapers' facts. A Defense Ministry commission had flown in from Moscow by special helicopter. The Komsomol Central Committee had sent a representative. The prosecutor's office was examining evidence submitted by the oblast KGB administration. Representatives of the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee were expected....

What did the investigators discover? "The journalists were in too much of a hurry to publish unverified facts"—that was the conclusion taken away by the Defense Ministry commission, after it had counted the DOSAAF [Voluntary Society for the Promotion of the Army, Aviation, and Navy] MIG's just in case. The oblast KGB administration announced that it saw no evidence of the sale of military secrets abroad, and handed over the case to the city prosecutor's office. The prosecutor found no evidence that Sergey Dyakonov had committed a crime, and decided not to bring criminal proceedings.

The idea of selling old MIG's abroad, or rather, exchanging them for sports equipment, came from Doronin, deputy chairman of Kaluga Oblast DOSAAF Committee. Nearby, at the dump, they are cutting them up into pieces with welders and selling them for scrap. Doronin is an airman himself, and this sight cuts him to the quick. So why not sell them to the West for currency and acquire that longed for hot-air balloon? Valeriy Nikolayevich had discovered for himself that you cannot buy one for rubles. Then he wrote a letter to the Defense Ministry: Let us do this, give us permission, and we will set up a school that people will come to from all over the union.

The reply came: We have no objection. And a list of organizations that will help to put it into practice.

Valeriy Nikolayevich did not hurry with his next move: Selling an airplane is not such a simple thing to do. Then the youth center came on the scene, having heard about the letter from the Defense Ministry by pure chance. Not in the least worried by the fact that they did not even have the planes, the guys drew up a letter to a foreign firm offering them MIG's. This is where they went wrong: Not only did they type the letter on Komsomol raykom notepaper but also, in addition to the MIG-15's and 17's, they included MIG-23's, which are still in service.

"We knew that they are going to be taken out of service, too, in due course, and we wanted to find a buyer beforehand," Larin said, explaining the situation.

This explanation is naive, to put it mildly....

Larin personally handed the letter to a representative of a foreign firm. He had long been "in the sights" of the KGB organs. That is how the letter reached Kaluga, and then the local journalists.

Of course, it is not only a question of the fuss about the young Kaluga businessmen. There is nothing wrong with their trying to extract some benefit from military property that was formerly being destroyed uselessly. But trade is a very complex profession, and like other professions, it cannot tolerate a dilettante approach. While the competent organs found no evidence of a crime having been committed, the damage done to the prestige of the new economy is obvious. Although the story itself is totally worthless.

Economic

Defense Industry Conversion Process Viewed

904G0024A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 16 Mar 90 p 3

[Report on interview with Doctor of Economic Sciences N. Mikhaylov, candidate for people's deputy of the RSFSR, chairman of the Union of State Scientific and Production Enterprises of Moscow, and general director of "Vympel" Central Scientific Production Association, by I. Yermakov; date and place not specified: "This Is a Wide Open Road... to Nowhere"—first paragraph is RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA introduction]

[Text] **"The conversion of the defense branches of industry has become a regular political doctrine, which is being implemented 'from above.' Given our scales and our conditions—this is a wide open road. But without taking economic factors into account, it leads nowhere," believes Doctor of Economic Sciences N. Mikhaylov, who is**

chairman of the Union of State Scientific and Production Enterprises of Moscow, general director of "Vympel" Central Scientific Production Association, and a candidate for people's deputy of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic].

[Yermakov] A half century ago we switched the economy of the country onto military rails. And since that time we have not been able to get the armored train onto alternate routes in any way....

[Mikhaylov] The railroad switches of our economy became rather rusted in the 45 years of the arms race. The structure of defense science and production was not only formed during these years, but it also became thoroughly numbed with immobility. Let us take a look, what do we plan to maneuver with today? What does the modern defense enterprise represent today?

First, during its entire existence under the state-monopolistic economy, it was clearly oriented on totally specific tasks, products, suppliers, and parts producing factories. A quick and effective rather than a gradual transition to another product is an extremely unusual and difficult task for a majority of them.

Second, the branch system of administration compelled them to rely principally on their own forces. And efforts at self-support, this characteristic feature of a feudal economy, led in the end to a totally closed technological system. Products at a majority of the defense enterprises are produced from "zero" to a finished article. The division of labor (the cornerstone of an efficient economy) is in an embryonic state. Try to break this kind of technological chain! What is needed here are not appeals, but economic incentives: an integral system of taxation and credit which establishes priorities for the development of specialized production.

And third, we will add a closed information system of the defense branches of industry, owing to both economic and also administrative security restrictions.

And so with one stroke of the pen we decided to turn the defense industry in the direction of satisfying social needs. Is this possible?

[Yermakov] Consequently, a real conversion is possible only with a new structure of the defense complex? But the creation of a new structure by taking into account not only political but economic interests as well?

[Mikhaylov] In adopting the concept of defense sufficiency, we must take the following step. First of all, it is necessary to affirm the organizational-legal positions concerning the defense branches of industry at a level of management of the country. And then to initiate the development of prospective conversion plans on their basis. In the first stage, naturally, the politicians will have the decisive word. But, then, with the creation of a new structure and with the development of a specific conversion program, we can no longer do without economic science and, the main thing, without economic incentives. Otherwise, today's "state order system,"—but, in fact, spontaneous conversion—will sooner or later lead us nowhere. For, in fact, it is wasteful, because it absolutely does not take into account the scientific and the technical engineering potential of defense enterprises. Here is an example of a typical pattern. For the last three years, enterprises of the radio industry have been developing trade and refrigeration equipment, which is absolutely uncharacteristic for them. And this when there is a catastrophic shortage in the country of television sets, computers, information science systems, and communications!

[Yermakov] But all that is needed to make a choice between a computer and a refrigerator is common sense....

[Mikhaylov] However, in resolving questions about specifically how to produce that computer, you cannot do without economic analysis. Here is an elementary task. The level of personnel skills in the defense industry is very high. A high scientific capacity is also characteristic for the technology of the defense industries. Naturally, all of this has an effect on the level of overhead expenditures and, naturally, their price can prove to be unacceptable, even considering the outstanding quality of the articles!

[Yermakov] What is to be done?

[Mikhaylov] Well, for example, here is one variant. Establish small enterprises on the basis of scientific production associations. By utilizing the accumulated defense industry potential, they will be able to reduce their overhead expenses to the limit. And produce a cheap product.

[Yermakov] Consequently, the main object of conversion, nonetheless, is not specific production capacities, but the experience, knowledge, and technology that has been accumulated by the defense complex?

[Mikhaylov] But in order for us to be able to transfer them to the national economy, they must first take shape in the form of a commodity, acquire a value, and, naturally, a potential consumer. A realistic instrument is needed for determining the economic efficiency of using scientific products. In other words, there must be a market for scientific products. For example, in the form of information data banks on the scientific and technical achievements of the defense enterprises that would become the informational basis for commercial activity. A place where supply and demand would meet. In a word, the future lies in conversion implemented not from "above," but on the basis of the initiative of enterprises and the development of "horizontal relations." The new departmental organizational forms—concerns and associations—fully conform to this. But here again we return to the necessity for a dynamic improvement in the structure of the defense complex. One that would make it possible to ensure a real entry of defense enterprises into an open economic market....

[Yermakov] And do you have something today to propose for this market? I mean you as the general director of the "Vympel" Central Scientific Production Association?

[Mikhaylov] As a result of research and elaboration, we arrived at a whole series of scientific and technical solutions that we could also apply to the social sphere. For example, in the establishment of a system of ecological monitoring of the condition of the atmosphere, water, and earth, both on a regional level, as well as in a specific region, city, or rayon. There are also interesting elaborations in the sphere of medical technology, nontraditional consumer products, and means of a technical production designation. And part of the achievements in the sphere of information science and communications are not inferior in their level to the world's best models.

[Yermakov] Is the realization of your plans possible under current conditions without an elementary legal guarantee of the proposed approaches to conversion!

[Mikhaylov] Life, fortunately, does not stand still. A number of important normative acts have already been adopted. We are continuing to work. In particular, I, together with other scientists and specialists, was able to participate in the preparation of the draft Law on Conversion, which has already been submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Export of Agricultural Products Examined

90UI0434A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 10 Mar 90 p 3

[Article by P. Kondratovich: "We Are Learning To Trade"]

[Text] Exporting agricultural products. You will agree that this combination of words sounds more typical of countries across the sea. And everything that pertains to us on this plane is most frequently associated with nostalgic recollections from 1913. But no. It turns out that even now we are exporting the gifts of the fields and forests. In 1989, for example, our agricultural exports amounted to about R1.5 billion. We even sold 318,000 tons of grain for hard currency. And at the same time we purchased tens of millions of tons of grain abroad.

What is this? A paradox or, on the contrary, a pattern in our foreign trade activity. Participants in the all-union conference on foreign economic ties in the USSR agro-industrial complex held a couple of days ago in Moscow tried to answer this and a number of other questions. And many problems had accumulated. And perhaps one of the most crucial is the catastrophic shortage of information on the conditions of the world market and the latest foreign agricultural technologies and, as a result, the absence of any kind of idea of our own capabilities at the international level.

Opening the conference, Yu.A. Borisov, the deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers State Committee for Food and Procurements, emphasized that our agro-industrial complex must establish deeper and closer contacts with world leaders in the area of agriculture. Without this it is impossible to make a quick breakthrough to stable high yields and the saturation of our domestic market with necessary products. But so far we have been successful in neither case. For example, 158 countries are members of the international Food and Agricultural Organization but so far the USSR is not among them. Under these conditions how can we make connections between the domestic and foreign economies, the need for which many speakers have already discussed? It has reached the point where sometimes it seems like a joke.

G.F. Rakhimbayev, deputy minister of foreign economic ties, cited the following facts: For more than a month people have been traveling throughout the country looking for a place to install 10 imported flow lines for producing margarine. We spent 50 million on them and they have not yet produced a single kopeck in return. In Moscow they build an immense combine for processing a million liters of milk a day, having outfitted it with ultramodern imported technical equipment. And to this day they are looking all over the country for specialists who can work with the electronics of the future.

As G.F. Rakhimbayev reported, each year about a billion rubles are spent on equipment for the agro-industrial complex. And then many enterprises do not know where to put it because frequently they had no idea that they were being given imported equipment.

Perhaps this confusion reigns because of the fact that too many departments are involved in foreign economic ties in the sphere of the agro-industrial complex. They include the Gosplan [State Planning Commission], the Ministry of Finance, the All-Union Association for Export and Import of Foodstuffs [Soyuzplodoimport], the All-Union Association for Export of Grain,....

"In brief, everyone and his brother," Yu.M. Luzhkov, chairman of the Moscow agro-industrial association, summed up from the podium after he had already started counting with the fingers on his other hand. "Therefore we do not even have a system of foreign economic ties as such."

Yuriy Mikhaylovich went on to announce that because of our random wandering over the earth looking for suppliers of tea, the prices of this product have almost doubled.

It turns out that at the beginning of last year the Soyuzplodoimport Association gave an assignment to purchase 210,000 tons of tea but in the middle of the year as an emergency measure they added another 30,000 tons. As a result we asked India for 70 percent of its export capacities and drove up the price of tea on the world market.

"The Gosplan has unrealistic plans and the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Foreign Economic Ties are signing even more unrealistic protocols for cooperation, and we have to take the rap," Yevgeniy Filippovich Sorochkin, general director of the Soyuzplodoimport Association, describing the mechanics of this kind of international activity.

True, the next speaker clarified that our consumers, that is, we ourselves, have to take the rap. As many of the speakers noted, because of the lack of a unified coordination center, many buying operations bypass the consumers and frequently run counter to their interests. This is why during the course of the two-day conference there were repeated suggestions concerning the need to concentrate all the trade in agricultural products in one place. In the opinion of the majority of participants in the conference it would be best if this were concentrated in the hands of the Main Administration for Foreign Economic Ties under the USSR Council of Ministers State Committee for Food and Procurements. Then the immediate producers of the products would be closer to the international market. Today they are on the sidelines and the hard currency they earn stays in the pockets of numerous trade intermediaries, which in no way contributes to the growth of our foreign trade balance. Indeed, how does one compare the R1.5 billion of our exports with the R13 billion we spend each year on purchasing products? It is no wonder that the country is always experiencing the most critical shortage of hard currency. And here is another way in which it is thoughtlessly wasted.

Well, how, for instance, do we regard this fact. A representative of Prodintorg reported the great achievement of his association which had purchased refrigeration capacities with a volume of 500 tons for our agricultural combines. And right there in the hall an emissary from one of the plants got up and stated that his enterprise was prepared to deliver these refrigeration capacities to anyone who wished them and they could pay in rubles. And they would be terribly happy if they could receive even one-tenth of the hard currency value in order to buy spare parts and patch up their own equipment.

"We must make hard currency work... for currency itself," stated the head specialist of the Vologda Oblast Agroprom for foreign economic ties, P.L. Vlasenko, from the podium. And to support this he gave many instructive examples from the practice of the Vologda workers who do not turn their noses up even at small transactions of 300 hard currency rubles.

But the ill-considered practice of issuing licenses for the sale of a commodity severely impedes local enterprise. Only representatives of the Ministry of Foreign Economic Ties have this authority.

"But it is ridiculous when a representative of a kolkhoz has to go to Moscow for a license to sell two dozen horses!"—N.A. Solodkiy, a representative of the Ukrainian Gosagroprom, said bitterly.

And Yu.M. Deduk, the director of the Belorussian Agrointorg, showed that just by exporting moose meat the republic could provide itself with all the equipment necessary for its processing industry. And it could still deliver plenty of mushrooms and berries to the international market.

"But how many pair of shoes do you have to wear out in endless trips through the ministry corridors in order to squeeze this ill-fated license out of them!" complained Yuriy Mikhaylovich.

Alas, the speeches of many of the leaders, as B.I. Kirichenko, sector chief of the agrarian department of the CPSU Central Committee noted, have shown that in questions of foreign trade the farmers do not have very good allies in Moscow. The USSR deputy finance minister, V.N. Semenov, basically said that professionals and not dilettantes should handle foreign economic ties. And since the kolkhozes and sovkhozes have the nerve to push their way into the tightly closed ranks of trade, they should be hit with such a tax that it will teach them not to do it in the future. And Viktor Nikolayevich gave a convoluted reference to various departmental directives with which any miscreant may be subjected to economic reprisal.

Many participants in this conference told me that our greatest problem is that sometimes when adopting good new laws and decrees we frequently leave in force numerous old instructions and executive acts that contradict them. And there are thousands of them. And these are what the bureaucratic system uses as guidelines, undermining any new undertaking on an absolutely "legal" basis. And even without this our economic machine finds a way to pick up steam.

Scientific

Supervision Official Comments on AES Data

PM0903115390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Yu. Rogozhin article: "Accidents at AES's. USSR State Committee for the Supervision of Safe Working Practices in Industry and Atomic Power Generation Reports on Incidents at Nuclear Power Stations in January and February"]

[Text] There were 46 power units in operation as of January 1990. Block Three at the Smolensk AES [nuclear electric power station] came on line in February. Statistics on unplanned reductions in capacity and shutdowns in January-February are as follows:

AES	Capacity Reduction	Stoppages Caused by:		Total
		Personnel	Equipment Failure	
Southern Ukraine		6	5	11
Zaporozhye	2	4	3	7
Kursk	4	1		1
Ignalina	1		1	1
Kalinin			1	1
Novovoronezhskaya		1	1	2
Smolensk	1	1	1	2
Rovno	1		1	1
Chernobyl			2	2
Khmelnitskiy			2	2
Total	10	13	15	28

At the Kalinin AES there were two safety system failures classified as accidents. There were no violations of the safety limits and conditions for the safe operation of the power units. The radiation situation at the AES's and controlled zones does not exceed the limits set for normal operation.

N. Shteynberg, deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for the Supervision of Safe Working Practices in Industry and Atomic Power Generation [Gospromatomnadzor], commented on the situation.

[Rogozhin] Nikolay Aleksandrovich, there was a report at the end of January about a discharge of radioactive water at the Kalinin AES. What happened there and what is the radiation situation today?

[Shteynberg] Indeed, owing to a personnel error, a steam generator was overfilled during a power unit shutdown, and up to 20 cubic meters of water containing a small amount of radioactive products escaped out of the steam generator through a safety device onto the roof of the machine hall. From there it entered the industrial sewerage system. A USSR Gospromatomnadzor and USSR Ministry of Health Commission has established that this highly regrettable violation of AES radiation safety instructions nevertheless did not lead to the personnel receiving higher radiation doses than normal or to any significant pollution of the environment whatsoever.

[Rogozhin] Your summary makes no mention of the work of research reactors. Could you say how many of them there are in the country and are there any in Moscow? Moreover, were there any serious accidents at them in January or February?

[Shteynberg] Our committee only monitors some of the country's research nuclear reactors. We monitor 11 of those belonging to the Academy of Sciences and other departments which are located in Moscow, Kiev, Minsk, Alma-Ata, Tashkent, Tbilisi, Riga, and Tomsk. Research nuclear reactors are being built in Ufa and Dushanbe. Apart from these reactors there are also several research nuclear reactors at the USSR Ministry of Nuclear Power Generation and the Nuclear Industry which are monitored by that department's inspection services. Several research reactors are in operation in Moscow, including one under our supervision at the Moscow Engineering and Physics Institute. The shutdown of reactors in Tbilisi and Alma-Ata was in order to carry out measures to check their safety and verify their resistance to earthquakes.

[Rogozhin] So everything's in order at research reactors?

[Shteynberg] There have been no nuclear or technical accidents at research nuclear reactors under the control of the USSR Gospromatomnadzor. [Shteynberg ends]

From the Editorial Office. Readers, like us, might reasonably ask: If not all research reactors are under the Gospromatomnadzor's control, who controls the others and in what way? Unfortunately, it is still not permissible to state the full number of research AES's or their location. We cannot obtain monitoring data either.... And this situation is extremely abnormal: Monitoring of highly dangerous installations is carried out by those who operate those installations. Nor do they bear any open responsibility to the public.... IZVESTIYA has learned that a commission looking into the problem of research nuclear reactors is now at work in Moscow. And we hope to familiarize readers with the results of its work.

Marchuk Reports to Academy of Sciences Meeting

PM2603105990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
21 Mar 90 Second Edition pp 1-2

[A. Pokrovskiy report: "Science of the Times of Perestroyka"]

[Text] As with many other questions, the topic of science in our country generates the most conflicting opinions. Their variety is natural. The country's economic mechanism is being restructured and science must occupy a worthy place in that mechanism if we want our country to gain leading positions in scientific and technical progress. We have a common interest in that. That is why readers have responded so keenly to the editorial office's invitation to continue the discussion on the future of science which was conducted at a recent scientific and technical conference on problems of managing scientific and technical progress.

I recall that, on the one hand, the conference noted that we should not talk about generally perceptible improvements, the country's present scientific potential is not ready to fully resolve the tasks facing the country. On the other hand it was noted that the national economy's long-standing unreceptiveness to scientific and technical innovations, disproportions in structural and investment policy, and omissions in developing science's material base have also helped to create barriers both between science and production and between academic or higher education science and sector-based science. Of course, it is from scientists above all that we expect answers to these and other questions. And they tried to provide them at the USSR Academy of Sciences annual general meeting [AGM] which opened in the Moscow State University assembly hall yesterday.

Never before, surely, has the USSR Academy of Sciences AGM opened in such a complex and tense situation demanding multifaceted, bold solutions. The agenda itself demonstrated a readiness to adopt those solutions. In addition to the traditional opening address by Academician G. Marchuk, president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and the report by Academician I. Makarov, chief academic secretary of the USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium, on the work of the USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium and the fulfillment of USSR Academy of Sciences general meetings' decisions in the period under review, the agenda included four more reports on the theme of "The role of science in the renewal of society." They were delivered to the general meeting by Academicians V. Kudryavtsev, K. Frolov, O. Nefedov, and V. Koptyug, vice presidents of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

This meeting, Academician Marchuk, president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, noted, is taking place at an extraordinary, crucial time. The country is now at a historic turning point, society is closely examining and analyzing its past and critically evaluating the present and seeking forms and methods to create a qualitatively new future.

The concept of perestroyka has absorbed all the previously untapped potential of scientific and social thought. Social practice is being renewed in all areas. But perestroyka is raising more and more new problems. Most often they are more difficult but also more long-term and creative problems. This determines the crucial tasks placed before fundamental science—both in creating a new knowledge base and in promoting social, political, and cultural development.

The logic of perestroyka has set Soviet science a task: to quickly reach the foremost position in the most important areas of fundamental research and, on that basis, implement the program for the socioeconomic reorganization of Soviet society.

Each month, each day, each week produce more and more new events which change our lives and often lead to a fueling of tension in society and the aggravation of the situation in the country. That is precisely why it is becoming clear to the majority of people now that cardinal measures are needed to stabilize the situation in the country.

Our country's scientific community bears particular responsibility. The strategy of perestroyka is based on a thorough understanding of science's role and the assimilation of its results as a powerful factor in attaining a qualitatively new state of our society.

The scientific backup for perestroyka is now becoming a priority. The abandonment of the administrative command system, the implementation of economic and political reforms, the creation of a rule-of-law state, and the elaboration of a realistic policy are impossible without the scientific community's constant involvement as an integral component of the political process.

Political and economic solutions are becoming particularly important in view of the heightened social perception that exists. Here, too, scientific forecasting and scientific expertise can give invaluable assistance.

The scientific community's extensive involvement in the decisionmaking process in addition to fulfilling its own, purely scientific, main function can and must be a powerful instrument for the democratization, humanization, and intellectualization of our society.

All this has made us realize the need for a detailed analysis of the entire system of work of our scientific institutions engaged in the expert appraisal and scientific validation of the country's development prospects.

The structure and methodology of forecasting and analysis have been radically revised and the academy has assumed responsibility for producing a comprehensive socioeconomic prognosis of the country's development over 20 years. This prognosis must replace the existing Comprehensive Program for the Country's Scientific and Technical Progress, which was closely linked to the elaboration of preplanned documents, with the result that departmental interests often eroded its objective scientific assessments and forecasts.

In addition to the annual report, we have presented to today's meeting one of the key methodological problems—that of the interaction between science and society. It seems to me that our society is now going through a stage of transition from a critical, consumerist, and sometimes disdainful attitude toward science to an understanding of the real significance of scientific knowledge and method in the process of its renewal.

Science, first and foremost fundamental science, must exert a determining influence on the sphere of material production, the environment, and international relations. Consideration of this problem is now highly important and topical.

Permit me now to briefly summarize the scientific results achieved by the Academy of Sciences in the year under review.

I shall begin with the social sciences, because the research of our scientists in the humanities is at the center of public attention. The scale and depth of the process of socialism's renewal are largely determined by its comprehensive character. The interconnection between the economy and policy, law and social relations, and national psychology and everyday traditions is so great, varied, and contradictory that underestimating the importance of any of the elements of social life in the course of perestroyka and misunderstanding of its development trends may seriously slow it down or substantially alter the expected results.

My point is that in the past two to three years a start has been made on developing the processes of humanizing fundamental science in the country, eliminating the various manifestations of technocracy, and increasing the attention paid to developing research in the social sciences and humanities, and there has been an orientation toward man.

Recently the Academy Presidium examined proposals from the social sciences section on measures affecting the development of research in the sphere of social sciences.

A decision has been adopted to broaden the front of research and create some new scientific institutions. For example, our proposals on organizing a socialist market institute and a USSR Academy of Sciences analytical center on problems of socioeconomic and scientific and technical development are now being examined by the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology.

As for the concrete results of scientific activity, I should like first to talk about the work, carried out in accordance with a USSR Supreme Soviet resolution, on the preparation of a report to the USSR Supreme Soviet on the state of the scientific elaboration of the problems of economic reform in connection with the examination of the relevant package of draft laws at a Supreme Soviet session.

It was felt expedient to instruct the Economics Department to prepare the report to the Supreme Soviet. Afterwards these materials were presented to a roundtable session involving economists, sociologists, lawyers, people's deputies, and representatives of interested ministries and departments and the mass media. In the light of that discussion the report was finalized and presented to the Supreme Soviet. But many problems still remain and must be resolved. It must be said as clearly as possible that the effectiveness of the scientific and scientific-organizational activity of the Economics Department and its institutes must be fundamentally increased.

Scientists' efforts in the sphere of philosophy and law were aimed at elaborating a theoretical framework to support the renewal and humanization of social relations. During this work their creative potential and all classical philosophical themes were focused on problems of man. A Human Sciences Center has been set up and is operating and work on a series of major monographs is in hand.

A concept of the formation of a society of renewed socialism, including an analysis of the development of a socialist formation in the context of the evolution of world civilization and the study of various models of socialism, has begun to be elaborated.

I should like to note the important initiatives of our lawyers who, together with Supreme Soviet deputies, are doing a lot of work in the drafting of legal acts. There is a particular need to mention our lawyers' preparation of a draft concept of our country's new constitution, which was recently presented for examination by a session of the Academy of Sciences Presidium.

The characteristic feature of historians' work is that they are addressing new themes and poorly studied or controversial questions.

The Literature and Language Department faces enormous tasks. This department's scientists have suggested new approaches to the solution of complex questions of ethnolinguistic relations in the country. They have made a substantial contribution to elaborating a draft law on languages which will be given a hearing soon at the Supreme Soviet.

One of the priority areas of fundamental linguistics is the study and preservation of the languages and cultures of the small peoples.

Dogmatic approaches to artistic creativity in literary science are being reassessed. Academic anthologies of the works of Akhmatova, Blok, Mandelshtam, Pasternak, Platonov, and other authors are being published here using new methodological principles for the first time.

In his presidium report "Literary Science as a Precise Science," Academician D. Likhachev convincingly showed the permanent value of studying source and archive material for the country's science and sociocultural development.

In this connection the question of opening the archives and placing them in our institutions is still relevant. I can tell you that the presidium has passed a resolution to allocate our present presidium building for the organization of the Ye.R. Dashkova Humanitarian Sciences Center.

Moving on to the results of scientific activity in the sphere of the natural sciences, the president of the USSR Academy of Sciences dwelt in particular on works on high-temperature superconductivity. Significant results have been obtained in this area by scientists in Moscow, Chernogolovka, Gorkiy, Tallinn, the Urals and Siberian departments, and the Leningrad scientific center.

A vast range of extragalactic astronomic research has been carried out within the space program using a 6-meter telescope. A young galaxy marked by a low heavy-element content has been discovered.

The Department of the Physical Technical Problems of Power Engineering has paid great attention in its work to elaborating a strategy for developing the country's power industry in the coming decade and beyond. An Academy of Sciences commission has developed a number of alternative power industry development programs providing three economic development scenarios using three different versions of energy saving and the export of energy resources.

The academy's scientific institutions have actively joined in the solution of problems of the reliability and security of atomic power stations. The newly created Academy of Sciences Institute of Problems of the Safe Development of the Power Industry has elaborated the principles and methods of probabilistic analysis of the reliability and safety of units and other elements of nuclear electric power stations [AES] as well as the principles of creating an integrated computer system for the analysis of the after-effects of AES accidents. The Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Academy of Sciences has joined in this work.

As for information technology, computers, and automation, it can now be said that the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decisions to develop scientific centers in the computer technology sphere within the Academy of Sciences is starting to have a tangible influence on the overall potential of research in the country.

For example, at the end of 1989 the "Elektronika SS SBIS," [expansion unknown, possibly: high-speed very large-scale integrated circuit] developed by the Academy of Sciences and the Ministry of the Electronics Industry, capable of 250 million operations per module per second, underwent factory trials. A double processor machine capable of 500 million operations per second is nearing the commissioning stage. The "Elbrus-3," capable of 1 billion operations per second, is in the final stage of creation.

There is another important result. The world's first laser information storage unit using optical cylinders has been developed and has undergone state tests. The design has been recommended for batch production, and a trial consignment has been included in the state order for the Ministry of the Electronics Industry. The wide-scale introduction of this device will make it possible to resolve the problem of external storage for personal computers. This is an example of a major piece of comprehensive work in which more than 30 of the country's leading scientific organizations have taken part, including the leading organization—the Ukrainian Academy's Institute of the Problems of Information Recording.

Progress in computer technology is now determined primarily by components. Scientific collectives from newly created or reinforced centers in Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Minsk, Taganrog, Novosibirsk, Krasnoyarsk, Tbilisi, Riga, and Vilnius are taking part in this research program. Research is being carried out in close conjunction with enterprises from the Ministry of the Electronics Industry, the Ministry of the Radio Industry, the Ministry of Communications, and other sectors.

In the sphere of the chemistry of new materials and materials technology, research is clearly oriented toward the creation of a new generation of construction and functional polymers, amorphous metallic substances, and ceramics with superconductivity and other important practical characteristics, which have an important practical application, light guiding filaments, and new materials for the electronics industry. A state scientific program of advanced materials has been drawn up under the direction of Academician B. Paton.

The problem of tumor research occupies a special place in biological sciences. The metastasin gene—the factor promoting the spread of cancer cells and the occurrence of metastasis—has been isolated.

Incidentally, it should be remembered that two state scientific and technical programs have already been put into effect. The first, called "Biotechnology," combines a whole series of genetic engineering research studies. The second program is called "Human Genome." Its aim is to determine the sequence of nucleotides which constitute the human genome.

A complex situation has developed in radiobiology. This year it has been decided to organize a radiobiological society and the question of setting up a radiobiological institute is being studied. But these measures are still not enough to meet radiobiology's urgent needs.

Work to create new strains of agricultural plants and breeds of livestock is being expanded. Many of them have been accepted for state tests.

In the sphere of earth sciences, increased attention has been paid to problems of seismic zoning [rayonirovaniye] and earthquake prediction. The Academy of Sciences Earth Physics Institute has prepared a "Provisional Seismic Zoning Map of the Armenian SSR," and together with the Lithosphere Institute has published the "Methodological Foundations of Geological Engineering and Seismological Studies in the Armenian SSR Disaster Zone."

The all-union program "Seismicity" has been developed and adopted, and a special "Prognosis" program and a new map of the country's seismic zones are being created, the latter to include all the latest data on processes in the earth's crust which lead to disasters. A package of special preventive measures has been developed for the territory of Kamchatka. An International Earthquake Prediction Theory and Mathematical Geophysics Institute has been set up.

Academy of Sciences' geographers have conducted a series of research studies in the nature protection sphere. A series of maps has been produced highlighting urgent ecological situations in our country. On this basis around 20 types of the most typical negative environmental changes have been highlighted, as have around 300 sites where such situations occur—they affect around 16 percent of the country's territory. The results of this work have been entered in a national report prepared by the State Committee for Environmental Protection for the Supreme Soviet and international organizations.

Major environmental research has been conducted by the USSR Academy of Sciences and union republic academies of sciences. This has already been mentioned above. The ecological program has led to the pooling of our efforts but needs further reinforcement. We hope to receive support for this research after the adoption of the USSR Law on Environmental Protection, the president said in conclusion.

Now let us take a close look at the new phenomena in the life of our main scientific staff, which were noted in Academician I. Makarov's report.

One of the USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium's main concerns was the creation of conditions for organizing competition and cooperation among scientific schools and tendencies and the development of competitive principles in scientific research. The concept governing the formation of programs and recommendations on organizing the work of councils and competition commissions were revised on the basis of the year's experience of the work of departments and institutes.

The speaker believed that there has been a definite breakthrough in scientists' traditional passivity in defending the interests of science via the mass media. PRAVDA published a conversation with the president of the USSR Academy of Sciences entitled "Foundation of Progress" and POISK had an item entitled "How Science Should Be," items which invite a broad public discussion on this theme. Both items have had a great social impact and there have been many responses, primarily from academy members.

The new system of financing research is aimed at turning research collectives headed by talented scientists working on the most topical problems into the main links in the organization of science. Nevertheless, in 1989 the USSR Academy of Sciences encountered financial difficulties not typical of recent years. The point is that a number of important fundamental programs—in high-temperature plasma physics, controlled thermonuclear fusion, earthquake prediction, space research, and others—which were carried out by the Academy of Sciences with the participation and financial support of interested ministries, ceased to be financed by them after the latter switched to economic accountability. That places the fulfillment of a number of projects in jeopardy.

But on the other hand, this is the first time that the anthology "Fundamental Research for the National Economy" has been published for the occasion of the USSR Academy of Sciences AGM. The size of the anthology itself indicates the great potential of academic institutions which can and must be used more actively in the country's economy.

This is just one facet of academy members' scientific and social activity. It is worth noting that 59 members have become people's deputies.

At the same time the speaker felt it necessary to make certain criticisms of them. I think, he said, that the general meeting has questions to put to its deputy-colleagues. USSR Supreme Soviet sessions hardly ever discuss and, more importantly, do not find solutions to questions of scientific and technical progress, the development of fundamental sciences, or the enhancement of the role of the USSR Academy of Sciences in our society's intellectual life. Speeches on these themes by deputies from the academy are extremely rare. We, as electors, are entitled to remind our esteemed elected representatives that they are representatives of the USSR Academy of Sciences in the supreme organ of Soviet power.

In the year under review there has been a reorganization and renewal of the network of the USSR Academy of Sciences' scientific councils working on the most important problems, which has made it possible to step up their activity. The USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium recommended the broader involvement of young scientists and higher school specialists in their work.

Incidentally, the speaker recalled that work connected with the rotation of leading cadres of USSR Academy of Sciences scientific establishments is continuing. Some 195 institute directors have been elected and appointed on a competitive basis. One hundred and nineteen journal editors and 30 academicians have become honorary directors of institutes, and more than 130 members of the USSR Academy of Sciences have become advisers attached to the management of scientific establishments.

This was followed by a remark which, for many of our readers, seemed completely unexpected. It appears that difficulties related to the recruitment of young scientists have increased in the Academy of Sciences. The fact is that after the introduction of contractual mutual relations for the targeted training of cadres with the partial reimbursement of training costs, many higher educational institutions are reluctant to conclude contracts with the USSR Academy of Sciences. Yet its institutions cannot pay for students' training. Furthermore, the recruitment of talented young people is seriously hampered by low pay in USSR Academy of Sciences institutions and unsatisfactory social and everyday conditions. The monthly salary of a young scientific staffer aged around 30 is almost one-third lower than the average in the national economy.

Last October there was a party conference of USSR Academy of Sciences scientists in Zvenigorod. There it transpired that the scientific community of the USSR Academy of Sciences is almost totally unaware of the presidium's decisions on cadre policy, questions of democratization, the new system of financing, the development of the social sphere, and so forth. On the president's instructions a selection of these documents was again sent to all institutes as well as party bureau secretaries. The USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium will continue to inform social organizations of its most important decisions. But there should be some feedback, so to speak. The public's reaction to given measures are important to the presidium, as are their comments and suggestions.

Rapidly developing foreign economic ties are a comparatively new type of activity for the USSR Academy of Sciences. In addition to the traditional patenting and licensing work, the past year has seen an expansion in the work of creating joint ventures, and a search is underway for commercial aspects of scientific cooperation which would be new to the academy and could be economically very effective. According to the results for 1988 the hard currency revenue of scientific establishments amounted to 7 million foreign currency rubles while in 1989 it exceeded 10 million.

There are 33 joint ventures now registered at the USSR Academy of Sciences and more than 25 in the preparatory stage. Because of the imperfection of the existing legislation and the scant experience of joint work, however, academic institutions do not always make maximum use of such cooperation. This process demands attentive study so as to prevent the discrediting of the idea of the sensible joint use of our intellectual potential for profit and prestige rather than to the detriment of our science and state.

Recently, quite a large number of cooperatives have been created under the academy's institutes. Some of them are working very well, bringing great benefit to institutes and the national economy. For example, the cooperative attached to the Institute of Applied Mathematics, is using personal computers to develop top-class software at prices considerably below those current in this sphere. However, there have been examples in which highly dubious cooperatives have been created under the auspices of the USSR Academy of Sciences which discredit the academy and the cooperative movement itself. The USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium proposes a special examination of the question of the place and role of cooperatives in the academy system.

The so-called brain drain, that is to say, the departure of talented and well-qualified scientists abroad for long periods of work by invitation, is a relatively new but already acute problem for the USSR Academy of Sciences. A large number of our scientists have been invited to work in the United States. In 1989, 246 people left the Academy for long-term assignments of up to five years. The departure of Soviet scientists abroad for practical scientific training and work has become a natural process, but it is necessary at the same time to give serious consideration to ensuring that it is not detrimental to the development of Soviet science.

It is clear even from the brief exposition of the reports how the tone of the debate of vital tasks concerning Soviet science and of the role of scientists in perestroyka was not the usual academic one but proceeded by way of discussion and did not duck issues. The next issue of PRAVDA will publish accounts of the reports delivered by the vice presidents of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

V.A. Medvedev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; I.T. Frolov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; and Academicians L.I. Abalkin and N.P. Laverov, deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers; are taking part in the general meeting's work.

Military

Defense Ministry Spokesman on Army Draft

LD2703112890 Moscow TASS in English 1132 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 27 TASS—"Calls for a considerable reduction in the Armed Forces down to the level of a small voluntary professional army seem clearly unconvincing now," Colonel General Grigoriy Krivosheyev, deputy chief of the Soviet Armed Forces' General Staff, told TASS today on the eve of this year's spring draft.

According to General Krivosheyev, a mixed procedure for the formation of the armed forces is practised in the Soviet Union: a corps of commissioned officers, ensigns, petty officers, men and women on active duty is formed on a voluntary basis, although not under contract but in accordance with current provisions for their service. Men are drafted for active duty in accordance with the law on universal military duty.

The core of the Soviet Armed Forces consists of professional personnel, accounting for one third of their entire numerical strength, Krivosheyev said.

"From the viewpoint of defence goals, it is preferable to recognise a mixed procedure for the formation of the Armed Forces, adopted, for example, in the armies of the Federal Republic of Germany and France," he pointed out.

The general believes that this professional core is a quite sufficient basis for the peace-time training of personnel to repulse a possible aggression and to deploy military units according to the mobilisation plan.

As the Army and Navy are provided with sophisticated hardware and armament, the share of the professional contingent will grow, the general believes.

"From the military point of view, a departure from the existing principle for the formation of the Armed Forces and their replacement by 'purely professional' salaried personnel are absolutely unjustified," Krivosheyev emphasised.

Speaking of the possibility of reducing the duration of military service, the general said that the existing terms—two years in the Soviet Army, coastal units and naval aviation and three years in the Navy—were established by the "law of the USSR on universal military duty" in 1967.

With due regard for wishes of the citizens of the USSR and the world trend towards gradual cuts in the duration of military service, the possibility has now appeared to reduce the term of service for Navy seamen and petty officers.

Proposals on that score have already been worked out. However, the general believes, it does not appear possible so far to reduce the term of military service for rank and file men and sergeants.

"This is connected with both the demographic situation in the country and the problem of training junior commanders and specialists—the level of contemporary hardware and armaments is rather high and it takes much time to master them," Krivosheyev said.

Rear Services Chief Outlines Supply Problems

PM2603160190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Mar 90 First Edition p2

[Interview with Army General V.M. Arkhipov, USSR deputy defense minister and chief of the USSR Armed Forces Rear Services, by unidentified KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent: "Priorities Dictated by Life"—date and place unspecified]

[Text] [Correspondent] The principle "Everything in the name of the individual, everything for the benefit of the individual" was proclaimed for many years in the Armed Forces, as elsewhere in the country, incidentally. We now admit that there have been more good intentions than real action. We now talk about priority being given to the social sphere. But do you not have the feeling that even this is still just talk?

[Arkhipov] I cannot agree that concern for the lives of Army and Navy servicemen is nothing more than words. I have served in the Central Asian, Transcaucasian, and Moscow Military Districts and know from firsthand experience that the commanders, political bodies, and officers in the rear services have always attached and continue to attach great importance to ensuring that servicemen have normal service and living conditions. Combat readiness would be simply impossible without this.

It is another matter that the social sphere has not been given priority over other areas. Military servicemen are part of our society and, as growth in the people's prosperity has, until recently, been implemented on the basis of the residual principle, exactly the same situation has existed in the Army and Navy. In our drive for parity in strategic arms, we have been forced to tighten our belts. For example, the construction of a modern aircraft-carrier or nuclear submarine costs hundreds of millions of rubles. Just imagine how many unbuilt homes, canteens, bath houses, and greenhouses that figure represents....

Perestroyka has opened up new approaches and set different priorities. Almost 87 percent of the national income is going to be channeled into current consumption and the development of the social sphere in 1990. A corresponding change of direction is also planned in the Armed Forces: We are now channelling two to three times more monetary and material resources into improving people's living conditions. Just last year alone, a total area of 3,255,000 square meters of housing, 147 barracks, some 100 canteens, more than 30 medical establishments, and 125 stores were built and commissioned....

[Correspondent] Nevertheless, judging by letters to the editorial office and speeches at the All-Army Officers Assembly, there are an increasing number of complaints about the lack of facilities provided for servicemen and members of their families and their inadequate social protection.

[Arkhipov] Yes, that is so. And I must admit that the criticism is warranted. There are objective reasons for this: the general increase in living costs, the cuts in the Armed Forces, the rapid withdrawal of troops from East European countries, and the neglect of the social sphere. All this makes the situation more difficult.

But the problems must be resolved. A great deal is being done in this direction. Officers recently had a pay raise and are now being compensated—albeit only in part—for expenses incurred in renting accommodations. Rations are being allocated to northern and remote regions, and it is to these areas that the Directorate of Trade Establishments for Military Personnel primarily sends goods and foods in short supply. However, the housing problem is really the most acute problem. As is well known, this problem was recently discussed by the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Questions of Defense and State Security. We must hope that this will bear fruit. I would like to remind you that the drafting of a government program to enhance the social protection of military servicemen and their families was announced at a recent meeting between USSR President M.S. Gorbachev and servicemen-deputies.

[Correspondent] Probably only the food problem could contend with the housing problem in terms of severity and immediacy?

[Arkhipov] Yes, it is, of course, one of the most serious problems in our country. At the same time, feeding the troops is the most important task for the rear services. The situation has recently improved somewhat in terms of the quality and range of foods. In the majority of units, the servicemen's diet is supplemented to a considerable extent by subsidiary plots. Incidentally, using our own resources we are now supplying personnel with meat for three months, potatoes and vegetables for four months, eggs for seven months, and milk for the whole year. There are even some units, such as the automotive battalion, for example, under the command of Lieutenant Colonel Yu. Usanov, which feed themselves throughout the year.

In terms of caloric content, the servicemen's rations meet the norms set for this kind of work, but as far as quality is concerned they cannot satisfy us. So we are now reviewing these rations with the intention of achieving a scientifically balanced diet of fats, protein, and carbohydrates: In particular, we are reducing the quantity of bread, mainly rye bread, but increasing the amount of meat, fish, eggs, and vegetables and introducing more milk, fruit or fruit juice, and polyvitamins. We intend to complete this work in the course of the next two years.

[Correspondent] Will the objects of this concern feel the results? There is a great deal of criticism about the organization of catering, the standard of service, and the quality of food preparation. There have been attempts to introduce a self-service system in servicemen's canteens, but this is proving difficult to get established....

[Arkhipov] New ideas always have difficulty in forging a path for themselves. That is what has happened in this instance: A self-service system has been introduced in some places, but no thought was given to the actual procedure and so lines began to build up. The system has now been improved, and there are virtually no waiting lines. A total of 70 percent of all canteens have now transferred to the new system.

The improved operation of Army catering services is being aided by the introduction of officer canteens for senior officers and even special canteens for senior warrant officers in some places. Measures to provide additional benefits for cooks are being discussed.

However, we still have a very long way to go before the situation is exactly as we want it. Many canteens offer monotonous, tasteless food, and the conditions are often unhygienic. But our biggest headache is theft of food. In the Transbaykal Military District, for example, Major A. Popkov, chief of the unit's provisions service, entered into a deal with Lieutenant Colonel V. Lugankin and Warrant Officer S. Ivanov to sell R42,000 worth of meat and dairy products in order to get rich quick. And in one unit in the Carpathian Military District the following scandalous fact has been brought to light: On the day checks were being carried out, the pot was found to contain only half of the meat it was supposed to contain.

Where do these people come from? Why is this sort of thing happening? There is no secret about this: The causes are indiscipline and failure to punish it, criminal neglect on the part of specific officials, and relaxation of exactingness by commanding officers and political bodies.

[Correspondent] And what about military kit? Everyone is interested in the new uniform. What are the prospects in this connection?

[Arkhipov] I personally believe that the present uniform is not bad at all. The mere fact that it has remained virtually unchanged for almost 30 years shows this. What is more, so many state resources have been saved! But life gets its own way nevertheless and the times dictate their priorities. Not too tight, comfortable, democratic. Not to mention field uniform: Combat experience has shown that even vests need to be better adapted for the use of weapons and ammunition, while footwear must be stronger and more comfortable.

Now about the suggested options for the new uniform, which were demonstrated at the All-Army Officers Assembly and approved as a whole. It is the unanimous opinion of the more than 30,000 men questioned that dress uniform and regular uniform should be the same color and close to the traditional color: olive. The officer's greatcoat suggested to replace the two existing greatcoats will be the same color and cut but in two versions: a winter greatcoat, and a lightweight coat with removable fur collar and lining. Both coats will give more freedom of movement than the old style. The summer coat is to be replaced by a raincoat made of synthetic fabric with removable lining.

Soldiers and NCO's are also being offered a double-breasted greatcoat with more freedom of movement and a wool-mix suit of universal design in place of the present uniform and regular single-breasted jacket, together with shorter boots—again, of universal design—with adjustable tops. Another important point is that we want to give officers and warrant officers the chance to choose their items of clothing themselves, within the limits of the money allocated. We hope that all this can be done during the next five-year period.

However, there are plenty of problems with the clothing service today. Few bath houses and everyday service combines are being built in the military districts or in the Navy. Improvements are slow in coming: This is an example of plenty of talking but few results. However, the most serious problems are thefts and fires. For example, clothing worth something in the region of R100,000 was stolen in the Baltic Military District last year. And more than R4 million went up in smoke and flames in fires in the Pacific Fleet. One striking fact is that losses and thefts increase when cuts are made in units, divisions, and military districts and when material values are transferred from one place to another. Clearly, some questions have not been thought through properly, and the situation must be urgently rectified.

[Correspondent] What is the state of the military health service today?

[Arkhipov] Military physicians have often been diverted elsewhere recently, because of emergency situations: Chernobyl, Armenia, the explosion on the gas pipeline, and now the events in Azerbaijan. But prophylactic and diagnostic work in the garrisons never stops for a single day. There have been improvements in this respect: The incidence of disease in the Army and Navy has fallen considerably in the last two years and labor losses have been reduced. But there are still a great many problems, and the prime sources of concern are accidents, catarrhal and pustular diseases, and constant outbreaks of stomach and bowel infections. We demand more professionalism, persistency, and principled behavior from physicians. But physicians alone cannot solve these problems if commanders and chiefs at all levels fail to ensure normal living and service conditions for servicemen (heating in the barracks, appropriate clothing for field exercises, observance of hygiene, and proper nourishment).

The program adopted to further improve medical services envisages amalgamating smaller hospitals located close to one another into larger hospitals—which will make it possible to furnish them with modern diagnostic and medical equipment and balance financial and cadre resources. It has been decided to develop regional clinics with the best possible medical equipment in the Far East and Turkestan Military Districts and to organize outpatient consultative and diagnostic centers attached to hospitals in every military district, so that they are in a position to conduct complex medical investigations independently.

[Correspondent] Trade is said to be a painful issue of social justice right now. Is this also true of our military trade or not?

[Arkhipov] Given the present unbalanced market in our country and the universal shortages, military trade is in an extremely difficult situation. We are trying not to lose heart, of course. And the general indicator does not look too bad: The trade plan was overfulfilled last year, which means billions of rubles. This was undoubtedly the result of hard work by military trade personnel. They have to show a sense of enterprise, business initiative, and energy. Last year, for example, they managed to obtain goods in high demand, worth R49 million, in the form of exchange from Czechoslovakia, Poland, Yugoslavia, and other countries. The military trade mission in the PRC has reached agreement on the supply of early fruits and vegetables to garrisons in the Far East and Far North on a commodity exchange basis. Purchases within the country cannot now be achieved without initiative and resourcefulness. We buy goods from collective farms, state farms, and cooperatives. By making cuts in the reserve, the Defense Ministry was able to transfer goods worth R47 million to military trade last year, and even more are to be transferred this year.

Nevertheless, the unhappy situation in the country affects and limits our potential. For example, in some regions—such as Siberia and the Far East—we come up against cases where there are stocks but food is not being released. The same kind of thing happens with medical preparations, special clothing, and other goods.

I must also say that opportunists, people indifferent to their work, and, even worse, shady, dishonest characters are still to be found in the military trade network. We are taking the strictest possible measures against such people. KRASNAYA ZVEZDA has written about this. People's controllers and the local public give us invaluable assistance in this respect.

[Correspondent] And the last question, Comrade Army General. You were troop commander for many years and are now head of the Armed Forces Rear Services. When was your job most difficult: then or now?

[Arkhipov] To be frank, I had had no real inkling of how difficult working in the rear services would be. Because of the country's tense economic situation, the material and technical supply of the Army and Navy is constantly in emergency situations. They give you no sleep or rest. But, on the other hand, you feel a sense of satisfaction when you manage to resolve the latest complex problem on time, fulfill a responsible task, and help people.

Yazov, Colleagues Sign Soldier's Obituary

PM2603160990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 25 Mar 90 First Edition p 4

[Obituary of Colonel General (Retired) V.A. Grekov]

[Excerpts] Colonel General (Retired) Vladimir Aleksandrovich Gerkov, a prominent political worker in the Soviet Armed Forces, has died suddenly. He devoted all his adult life to selflessly serving his socialist homeland and to the cause of the Communist Party, in whose ranks he had served since 1932.

V.A. Grekov was born 23 July 1912 in the village of Proyezheye, Starobelskiy Rayon, Voroshilovgrad Oblast. [passage omitted]

[Signed] D.T. Yazov, M.A. Moiseyev, P.G. Lushev, K.A. Kochetov, A.D. Lizichev, Yu.P. Maksimov, V.I. Varennikov, I.M. Tretyak, A.N. Yefimov, V.N. Chernavin, M.I. Sorokin, V.M. Arkhipov, V.M. Shabanov, N.V. Chekhov, V.L. Govorov, D.S. Sukhorukov, Yu.A. Yashin, N.I. Shlyaga, V.I. Grebenyuk, G.A. Stefanovskiy, A.I. Maslov, V.S. Rodin, N.A. Moiseyev, N.M. Boyko, G.M. Bekov, V.I. Panin, A.I. Shirinkin, V.M. Kozhbakhteyev, N.F. Grachev, G.V. Kochkin, A.P. Silantyev, A.V. Gorbachev, I.M. Panov, A.P. Maresyev, G.V. Sredin, V.M. Grishakov, A.A. Babayants, and A.L. Reshetnikov.

Baltic Republics

Vilnius Radio Carries 27 Mar Council Session

Current Situation Assessed

LD2703084990

Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0700 GMT on 27 March begins carrying a live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius. An unidentified announcer first points out that the council is resuming unfinished work from yesterday's session—a debate on a statement on KGB informers. At 0705 GMT Deputy Juknevicius reads the text of a statement. This is followed at 0708 GMT with debates on this statement.

At 0723 GMT the deputies register; 101 deputies are present.

At 0733 GMT the statement is adopted with minor amendments.

At 0736 GMT Landsbergis takes the floor and gives a report on the political situation.

At 0750 GMT Internal Affairs Minister Misiukonis takes the floor and gives a report on events in Naujoji Vilnia Hospital and its entry by Soviet troops. Deputies then question him about the situation in Vilnius.

At 0802 GMT Deputy Zigmas Vaisvila calls for armed militia to guard all strategic objects in the capital, even though they can offer no resistance to the well-trained and heavily armed Soviet troops. The republic's government should protest to Moscow about the actions of the Soviet Army, he says.

At 0807 GMT the plenary sitting of the session adjourns until 1200 GMT.

Hospital Raid Discussed

LD2703132790

Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1200 GMT on 27 March resumes its live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council in Vilnius.

At 1202 GMT the Lithuanian prosecutor makes a statement on the storming of the psychiatric hospital in Najoji Vilnia.

At 1207 GMT deputies put questions to the prosecutor who states in reply that the soldiers were armed during their action in the hospital but did not fire their weapons.

At 1209 GMT Brazauskas makes a statement on the capture of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee building.

At 1217 GMT a draft statement by the Lithuanian government on events in Lithuania is read.

At 1225 GMT a vote is taken on a note to the Soviet Government, and it is approved.

At 1232 GMT a message from Lithuanian physicians to the physicians of the world on the capture of the hospital in Lithuania was read.

At 1234 GMT a message from the Solidarity Club and the Polish Sejm is read by Wladyslaw (Jeremiak).

At 1240 GMT the deputies discuss how to appeal to world governments.

At 1245 GMT an appeal to countries which signed the Helsinki Act on Cooperation and Security in Europe is approved.

At 1250 GMT the session adjourns until 1320 GMT.

Landsbergis Addresses 27 Mar Council Session

LD2703091490 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0736 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Statement by Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Council, at the Supreme Council session in Vilnius—live]

[Excerpts] Esteemed colleague deputies:

I would like to address you briefly and discuss the most important events, which are concentrated in one or two words, when this word is uttered by an official; also when this word means a change of position and a threat.

We must assess the information regarding the meeting between M. Gorbachev and Senator Edward Kennedy that took place yesterday in Moscow. During this meeting, M. Gorbachev allegedly said force would not be used in Lithuania unless people are threatened. I did not happen to hear the senator himself or the U.S. Government react to this essential change of position. Earlier we heard announced statements and comments, and Shevardnadze, the foreign minister, would contact Secretary of State Baker. On more than one occasion it was said that force would not be used unless public order had to be maintained—the state has the obligation to carry this out. When concern was voiced, if this concerned the development of events in the Baltic republics, explanations were given that this was not so, because this exception concerned only the Caucasus republics as eveything was calm in the Baltic republics, and there should be no such intention.

We can see that force has been used in the Caucasus, perhaps after certain permission was received. In the Baltic states, including Lithuania, no disturbances or cases of violence against citizens have taken place, as a result of which the leadership of the Soviet Union should have no cause to voice its concern.

Despite this, the Government of the Soviet Union started escalating its statements of concern and made great efforts to ensure that in some way some tension would be artificially created.

The main contribution to achieving this was the concentration of troops, the behavior of the troops, and their actions. All this comes from Moscow alone—increasing the tension and threatening the use of violence if the tension is increased.

Now we hear that a new position has been formulated about the future use of force. Concern is also caused by the State Department announcement that on Sunday Mr. Baker sent a secret telegram to Shevardnadze concerning Lithuania. It is possible that this is a reply to a telegram from Shevardnadze on Lithuanian matters. Also, we do not know if this is the repetition of new secret protocols in a scenario exclusively reminiscent of that in 1940.

Yesterday, after repeated requests, we received from the leadership of the Vilnius garrison a list of alleged attacks against servicemen of the Soviet Army in Lithuania. Most of these have been presented for the first time; the Internal Affairs Ministry had not been informed, therefore no investigation could be carried out to discover if someone had thrown a stone at a servicemen or not. Other cases mentioned are of such a nature that one can say about these what one would like to say, and one could write down as many of such cases as one wished. This reminds us of the atmosphere of 1940, when a Soviet soldier left his barracks without permission. He delayed his return because he stayed with a girl of easy virtue. This was qualified as a gross crime committed by the republic of Lithuania against the Soviet Union, and the accusations were escalated up to an ultimatum.

Therefore, our historical experience, which the West does not have, as well as our awareness of whom we are dealing with, and this has not been experienced by the West either, cause our concern that the West is being cheated, or perhaps has made concessions.

Perhaps the West has made concessions to Moscow's demands to solve their problems by using force here in Lithuania.

I have made several statements about this by telephone, as well as here to foreign journalists. At the moment it is night over there across the Atlantic, and when the morning comes certain steps will be taken there. However, here in Lithuania we do not know what will happen until then.

Bloody violence has started here in Lithuania already; it was carried out without constraint at a hospital in the presence of a white-gowned doctor and a nurse. No constraint was shown in cutting the telephone wires in a place like a hospital, where telephones are vital from the humanitarian point of view.

You have probably already heard that last night the Naujoji Vilnia Hospital was stormed, and that people, at least several scores of them, were beaten up and captured. Others managed to flee. They were people who had temporary shelter there. [passage omitted] Some hours later a similar attack was carried out in [name indistinct], near Kaunas. The minister of health reported that patients were kidnapped from there. I am sure the Supreme Council will voice its opinion on this. Perhaps the Council of Ministers will have to adopt a decision.

Yesterday we made an appeal to the people of Lithuania—perhaps we will do this today—on how people should react when confronted with acts of open aggression. I think everything we can recommend, and what the people of Lithuania should do, is maintain maximum calm, because according to the programmed scenario now being executed it seems that the other side is in great need of resistance, which would immediately be interpreted as an assault. In turn, I do not doubt that we will have significant support from the public of democratic states, from movements in the Soviet Union and in the neighboring countries. Yesterday we received a telegram of firm support signed by the delegates of the Estonian Communist Party Congress. The telegram reads that only negotiations on equal terms between Vilnius and Moscow could eliminate aggravation of the conflict. This was support for the decision of the Lithuanian Supreme Council, which had reinstated its statehood liquidated by the annexation of 1940.

I hope the Estonian Communist Party has not been thrown out of its building, as has already happened here in Vilnius this morning. The occupation of buildings continues. Also, we are unable to receive any information from the military leaders in Lithuania, with whom the list of wishes placed by Comrade Burokevicious remains. Perhaps today we will have to ask about this again.

Demonstration Begins Outside Party Building

LD2703122190 Stockholm Domestic Service in Swedish 1030 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] [Announcer] The Lithuanian capital is a place of tension right now, prior to the big demonstration to be held by Russian speakers in Vilnius this afternoon. Vladislav Savic in Vilnius can tell us of the increasing fear of provocations in a very sensitive situation:

[Savic] There are an exceptionally large number of people on the streets of Vilnius today. The unease is great in light of the latest developments. Outside the Central Committee building there are now a couple of hundred Lithuanians, seeing with their own eyes that it is true that the military have taken over the building. One can see many resolute faces, since they heard the news on Lithuanian radio and television that the military have also begun the hunt for deserters.

[Begin recording] [Unidentified woman's voice in Russian, fading into reporter's translation] It's terrible! It's terrible! (?They have taken) the republican hospital in New Vilnius. That's why I'm crying! That's why I'm crying! [end recording]

The woman was standing outside the Central Committee building, which at 0400 Swedish time [0200 GMT] was occupied by the Soviet military. When I was there earlier this morning, most people (?were) upset. This is the Moscow Mafia! we heard a man scream, while a weeping woman shouted: This is Gorbachev's freedom! Gorbachev's freedom after 50 years! before she was interrupted by some Russian women screaming: Shut up! to the weeping woman. This is just a comedy you are playing, shouted the Russian women. Are you happy now? responded the Lithuanians at the scene.

Only the members of the Communist Party that is loyal to Moscow are let into the building. Algirdas Brazauskas, leader of the independent Communist Party that split with Moscow in December, is no longer allowed into the building. Speaking at a news conference today, Brazauskas said that he had not had time to talk with Mikhail Gorbachev today. But Brazauskas did say that he had spoken with the party's chief ideologue, Vadim Medvedev, and found out that this morning Medvedev did not know of the action against the Central Committee building. Brazauskas went on to say that he personally did not think Gorbachev knew in advance of the action.

In an hour or so, the Russian-speaking organization in Lithuania, Yedinstvo, is expected to hold a demonstration outside the parliament. A short while ago, the Lithuanian [deputy] prime minister, Romualdas Ozolas, held a news conference, warning that there could be various kinds of provocation, and that the demonstrators might try to take over the building, and to provoke fighting so that the military would intervene. Journalists were urged not to act provocatively and give the military any cause to intervene. The situation is thus very tense in Vilnius.

[Announcer] A message has just been received from the Soviet news agency TASS. It says that Soviet General Valentin Varennikov confirms that Lithuanian deserters have been arrested at a psychiatric clinic in the capital, Vilnius. The Soviet Army has set up social groups with the task of hunting and arresting deserters in Lithuania, Varennikov told TASS.

Reportage on Seizure of Party Buiding, Hospital

Occupation of Building Confirmed

LD2703112390 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 0916 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow (ADN) correspondent—The occupation of the Lithuanian Communist Party building by Soviet paratroopers has been confirmed by Simas Artjunas, representative of the Press Office of the Lithuanian Supreme Council, to ADN's Moscow office. It has not been possible to obtain a comment from the Central Committee, as all telephone links to it are broken.

A spokesman for the Sajudis movement told ADN that an attempt had already been made, at around 2230 hours local time on Monday to storm the party building. The second, successful attempt was started around 0400 hours local time on Tuesday. The action had been filmed by a United States television team working in Vilnius, but the cassettes were confiscated.

According to the Sajudis representative, of the total of 26 deserters who had sought refuge in a hospital in Vilnius, 12 have been arrested by paratroopers and brutally beaten. The others succeeded in escaping. A similar action to arrest deserters also took place at a psychiatric clinic in Kaunas. There two people were arrested. They later turned out to be regular patients.

Army Seizes Deserters

AU2703071090 Paris AFP in English 0659 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] Vilnius, Lithuania, March 27 (AFP)—Soviet soldiers burst into three hospitals during the night and seized young Lithuanian army deserters, eyewitnesses told AFP on Tuesday.

Paratroopers armed with automatic weapons also occupied the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee building here, a parliamentary spokesman said.

Soldiers beat up several of the deserters and their police guards in the Naujeja psychiatric hospital about 20 kilometres (12 miles) from here, leaving blood spattered on a staircase, witnesses said.

Eighteen of the recruits, who deserted after Lithuania declared independence on March 11, managed to escape, the sources said.

Troops also raided a hospital in Kaunas, Lithuania's second biggest town, and another at an unspecified location.

More than 1,000 young Lithuanians are believed to have deserted from the Red Army since the republic declared itself independent 50 years after being annexed by Moscow.

Health Minister on Hospital Raid

LD2703101190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0810 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Report by correspondent Jurate Valanciute]

[Text] At 1030 we telephoned Lithuanian Health Minister Juozas Oleka: [Begin Oleka recording] They phoned me at about 0400. I went there immediately with my deputy, Doctor Blazys, and Doctor Navasinskas from Naujoji Vilnia to the Naujoji Vilnia mental hospital, to the premises allocated to the Red Cross branch to shelter soldiers who have left the Army. We found the personnel who witnessed these events and who were jostled; the Red Cross flag was torn down, premises were damaged. We did not find the young people who were sheltering there. It emerged that at 0300 two vehicles—and some people say more than two—of armed Soviet airborne troops surrounded the building and, threatening with their weapons, entered the premises where young people were sheltering. Some of those young people have left the premises, but we do not know whether they were stopped outside, and people who stayed in the building were grabbed by force and beaten; we found traces of blood on the stairwell. People, [word indistinct] were beaten, driven outside, put into the vehicles and taken away.

Militia Lieutenant Strogys, who arrived there by coincidence, was beaten and left lying on the street. And they left. The militiamen have inspected the place [passage indistinct]

At about 0400 we were informed that about 10 armed soldiers entered the premises of a mental hospital in Kaunas Rayon, pushed the personnel away and [passage indistinct]. Patients were moved from their beds [passage indistinct] I cannot say exactly. [Passage indistinct] Siauliai and Klaipeda about the situation of these former soldiers. We are preparing and waiting so that there is no confusion in rendering medical assistance. We invite people to be calm, not to give in to that crude and violent [words indistinct]. [end recording]

Radio Reports Seizure of Building

LD2703091790 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0810 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Benas Rupeika report]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] I think every minute and every second is very important to the radio because the occupation of the Lithuanian Communist Party building is an event which, I think, will decide the development of events in Lithuania. The building was occupied at 0700. Airborne troops slipped through the door and spread to all floors. The building is still surrounded, and I stayed there with my microphone until 0930.

You will hear a very poor recording of the event, but I think at present the content is more important than the quality of the recording. I start my recording from the Central Committee door with the voices of the Vilnius residents assembled there, and then you will hear the ensuing events. I remind you that you will hear voices of the Central Committee officials, my acquaintances [word indistinct], Gediminas Kirkilas, Arvydas Matulionis, Mindaugas Stakvileviius, Justas Paleckis, Domas Sniukas, and Algirdas Brazauskas, and also servicemen whose voices you will recognize. [passage indistinct] [voices heard: one shouts "invaders," some voices are in Russian; laughter is then heard, followed by some casual but generally indistinct conversation]

[Announcer] You just heard a report from the surrounded building of the Central Committee. We apologize for the quality of the recording. You must understand that it was not easy for Benas Rupeika.

I also wish to announce the following appeal to the citizens of Lithuania: Lithuanian television is instructed to announce that in order to establish the initiators of possible provocations and the violations of public order and participants, the progress of today's unsanctioned meeting outside the building of the Supreme Council will be filmed by Lithuanian and foreign television stations, and also by the (?staff) of special services.

Landsbergis Protests

LD2703105290 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0810 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] Jurate Valanciute is at the microphone: I wish to add that the chairman of the Supreme Council of the republic of Lithuania, Vytautas Landsbergis, made this morning the following comment on last night's events: This was expected, and was done very brutally. The Soviet Army confirmed once again that it is an occupation army. It is a great pity that this has been enhanced by Western politicians, with their lack of reaction to Gorbachev's decision that force would be used in Lithuania. They should protest very sternly but I have not heard that any Western state has done so. They are thus taking responsibility for the violence that is taking place, and that may take place, stated Vytautas Landsbergis.

Landsbergis Discusses Gorbachev Role in Events

AU2703140590 Paris AFP in English 1337 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] Vilnius, March 27 (AFP)—President Mikhail Gorbachev and other Soviet leaders did not know the Army had seized Lithuanian Communist Party headquarters, Lithuanian party chief Algirdas Brazauskas said Tuesday.

But the report was contradicted by the president of the Lithuanian parliament, Vytautas Landsbergis, who said Mr. Gorbachev "knows very well what is happening" in Lithuania.

Mr. Brazauskas said Soviet ideology chief Vadim Medvedev had told him by telephone early Tuesday that he did not know that the Army had seized party headquarters and rounded up Lithuanian deserters from the Red Army.

"And I believe him," Mr. Brazauskas said, adding that if Mr. Medvedev did not know, then neither did Mr. Gorbachev.

But Mr. Landsbergis said Mr. Gorbachev was behind the military action and might later blame the Army.

"He (Mr. Gorbachev) can destroy us with the help of the Army and then sack a few soldiers to wash his hands (of the matter)," Mr. Landsbergis said.

Mr. Landsbergis said Mr. Gorbachev had changed his position. "He will use armed force if there is a pretext, and a pretext can easily be found."

Landsbergis on 'Collusion' Between Moscow, West

AU2703093690 Paris AFP in English 0906 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Sylvie Lanteaume report]

[Excerpt] Vilnius, Lithuania, March 27 (AFP)—Soviet soldiers seized young Red Army deserters sheltered in three hospitals and occupied the Lithuanian Communist Party headquarters overnight, officials and eyewitnesses told AFP Tuesday.

Following the Soviet action, Lithuanian President Vytautas Landsbergis told parliament: "Now we don't know what's going to happen," and said there could be "collusion" between the West and Moscow.

"Because of our history and what we know about those we're dealing with, we can suspect that the West is lying to us," he said.

Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia were annexed by Stalin in 1940 under a secret agreement between Moscow and Nazi Germany.

Soldiers beat up several of the deserters and their police guards in the Najojia psychiatric hospital about 20 kilometres (12 miles) from here, leaving blood spattered on a staircase, witnesses said.

Around 30 deserters were sheltered in the hospital and 18 of them managed to escape, the sources said.

Between 200 and 1,000 young recruits are believed to have deserted after Lithuania declared independence on March 11, saying they would not serve a "foreign army."

Troops also raided a hospital in Kaunas, Lithuania's second biggest town, and another at an unspecified location, where deserters were sheltered.

It was not known how many had been arrested.

Paratroopers armed with automatic weapons seized control of the Communist Party Central Committee building here in the early hours of Tuesday, a parliamentary spokesman said.

An American television reporter said 35 soldiers took part in the operation. The Lithuanian party, which declared itself independent from Moscow in December, held a plenum in the building on Monday.

Troops accompanied by pro-Moscow members also took over two party buildings here on Sunday, and on Monday seized the party headquarters in Lithuania's main Baltic sea port Klaipeda.

The authorities confiscated film taken by two American television crews of the Army entering the party headquarters here, and arresting the deserters.

The deserters and Sunday's occupation of party premises had topped the agenda at talks between Lithuanian officials and Red Army colonels on Sunday night and Monday.

The latest Army action apparently broke an agreement announced by Vice-Premier Romualdas Ozolas after Monday's talks that neither side would take "any action without informing the other."

Mr. Ozolas, who led the Lithuanian delegation, said Monday's talks had secured the basis for negotiations "at a higher level."

They had agreed to set up a "coordinating committee" and it was due to meet again on Tuesday.

Mr. Landsbergis hinted on Monday that he might travel to Moscow for talks with President Mikhail Gorbachev.

Meanwhile, conservative Politburo member Yegor Ligachev said that "tanks will do nothing to help" resolve the situation in Lithuania.

Mr. Ligachev ruled out military intervention, saying Moscow knew better. "We will resolve this question within the framework of our laws", he told the weekly ARGUMENTY I FAKTY. Lithuanian secession would be a "great calamity".

U.S. Senator Edward Kennedy said after meeting Mr. Gorbachev on Monday that the Soviet leader had ruled out using force in Lithuania "unless the lives of others were threatened." Mr. Kennedy said Mr. Gorbachev had not specified who he had in mind. [passage omitted]

Landsbergis Appeals to West for Help

AU2703092890 Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network in German 0900 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] Lithuanian President Vytautas Landsbergis has voiced concerns that the Soviet Union is resolved to use force in the Baltic republic which declared its independence on 11 March. In Vilniustoday [27 March] Landsbergis therefore appealed to the West to help Lithuania. He justified his concerns with the statement made by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev that Moscow would intervene militarily if the lives of civilian persons were threatened. Landsbergis interpreted this statement of the Kremlin chief, saying that such a threat could easily be created by the Soviet Union itself.

In the early morning hours today, Soviet military units stormed several hospitals in Lithuania and arrested numerous young men who had defected from the Red Army following Lithuania's declaration of independence. In addition, Soviet paratroopers occupied the

Vilnius Central Committee building of the Lithuanian Communist Party, which had broken with Moscow.

General Defends Seizure of Lithuanian Deserters

LD2703101190 Moscow TASS in English 0949 GMT 27 Mar 90

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Moscow March 27 TASS—Special teams to hunt deserters have been set up in Lithuania, a high-ranking Soviet general revealed to TASS today.

Army General Valentin Varennikov, commander-in-chief of the land forces and deputy defence minister, confirmed that Soviet troops had detained several Lithuanian deserters hiding in a psychiatric hospital in Vilnius.

"Deserters, who have become militants of the Sajudis [Lithuanian Movement for Restructuring] nationalist organisation, were undergoing special training and not treatment in one of the buildings of the hsopital," Varennikov insisted.

The creation of paramilitary units in Lithuania is "an illegal act and can lead to dangerous consequences," he warned.

Varennikov accused Sajudis leaders of provoking Lithuanian young men to desert from the Soviet Army.

"They are helping deserters to illegally get the necessary documents from local authorities."

As of today, a total of 23 Lithuanian deserters have been arrested in Lithuania, officials at the Soviet General Staff told TASS.

Interviewed on Situation

PM2603203990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Mar 90 Second Edition p 8

[Dispatch by PRAVDA special correspondent Yu. Shabanov in Lithuania incorporating interview with Army General V. Varennikov, commander in chief of the Ground Forces; date unspecified, under the rubric "Topical Interview": "Preserving Order"]

[Text] Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]—Our conversation with Army General V. Varennikov, commander in chief of the Ground Forces, was brief. The commander in chief's every minute is spoken for, but, despite this, he found half an hour to meet with journalists.

[Shabanov] Lithuanian television showed a video clip of combat hardware moving through Vilnius at night. The accompanying commentary was this: The occupiers are stepping up the pressure. What is the purpose of bringing Army units into the city?

[Varennikov] It is certainly true that an assault regiment entered Vilnius. Why at night? So as not to impede the movement of city transport or alarm the inhabitants. We are carrying out the instructions of the USSR president and Government to reinforce the protection of important state installations on Lithuanian territory. We have come here not to fuel tension, as the "Sajudis" press makes out, but to calm the population and prevent possible unrest.

[Shabanov] But surely that is the domain of internal affairs organs?

[Varennikov] Have you heard what Misiukonis, the republic's present internal affairs minister, said in parliament? "Are you going to fulfill the laws of the Soviet Union?" deputies asked him. "No." "What about Lithuanian laws?" "Yes." How can we entrust the protection of state installations to a man who refuses to fulfill Soviet laws? [Varennikov ends]

And surely the laws being adopted in parliament that are at odds with the USSR Constitution are leading to destabilization of the situation? And what about deputies' inflammatory actions and statements in the local press encouraging soldiers of Lithuanian nationality to leave their place of military service?! It has been announced in parliament that the republic will take them under its protection. What is more, V. Landsbergis is giving fatherly advice to the deserters: Do not go home or to your friends but seek refuge in churches, they will not get you there. Good advice if you consider that desertion carries the penalty of criminal charges for these youngsters. We saw a minibus outside the Supreme Soviet carrying soldiers who had fled from their units. We wanted to talk to them for a moment, but they refused to. It seems that the chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet has forbidden them to communicate with journalists from "an alien power."

I think the purpose of this is perfectly transparent. "Sajudis" is registering volunteers for so-called regional defense detachments throughout the republic. They need strong men with military training. R. Rozulyavichus, one of the leaders of the "Sajudis" organization in Kaunas, was very frank about the registration of volunteers:

"We are an independent state and an army is an indispensable attribute."

This made Rozulyavichus' assurances that the volunteers are needed only to maintain order even less credible. A decision has been made to set up 37 checkpoints on the border with Belorussia and the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]—which are evidently considered foreign powers. The registration of volunteers is moving at a rapid pace. According to those doing the registering, some 200-300 people are registering in Kaunas every day.

In this kind of situation, I think that the actions of the servicemen who confiscated weapons and ammunition from DOSAAF [Voluntary Society for the Promotion of the Army, Air Force, and Navy] clubs and, after drawing up the papers required in such cases, placed them under safe protection are right.

And here is the latest news. Publication of SOVETSKAYA LITVA, the newspaper of the Lithuanian Communist Party (loyal to the CPSU platform), resumed Sunday 25 March. Unfortunately, the republic leadership has not found it possible to supply either paper or printer's ink for the newspaper of the 40,000-strong detachment of communists. SOVETSKAYA LITVA is being printed outside the republic. In its address to readers, it said: "Our newspaper is the organ of the Lithuanian Communist Party. We exclude the words 'loyal to the CPSU platform'... We have no need of any additions to or explanations of the party name. But they are needed by the so-called 'reorganized' Lithuanian Communist Party, which... has completely rejected Marxist-Leninist ideology and philosophy... and takes its cue from double-dyed nationalists and apologists of the bourgeois system."

Elections to the republic's local soviets have been held. According to preliminary figures, just over 60 percent of the electorate took part. This is far less than in the elections to the republic Supreme Soviet.

Further Soviet Army Actions in Lithuania

AU2603193390 Paris AFP in English 1920 GMT 26 Mar 90

[Text] Vilnius, Lithuania, March 26 (AFP)—The Soviet Army took over another Communist Party building in Lithuania on Monday, after its forces had secured two party buildings here Sunday, a member of the Sajudis nationalist movement said.

Vilius Kavalauskas told reporters here that paratroopers had occupied Communist Party headquarters in the port of Klaipeda, and placed it under the command of the town's party second secretary, an ethnic Russian.

Lithuanian president Vytautas Landsbergis meanwhile told reporters here that soldiers had reportedly surrounded the university in the Baltic state's second city Kaunas.

If confirmed, the moves would seem to breach a verbal agreement, reached Monday between Lithuanian Deputy Premier Romualdas Ozolas and two Soviet military officers, that neither side would take any action without first informing the other.

A war of nerves has been waged between Vilnius and Moscow since the republic declared independence on March 11.

Mr. Landsbergis also hinted that he might travel to Moscow for talks with Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev. Asked to confirm rumours that he could fly to Moscow next week, he replied: "I do not know whether I shall see President Gorbachev or just send him a message."

Mounting Tension in Lithuania Examined

PM2603183190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 27 Mar 90 First Edition p 1

[Report by KRASNAYA ZVEZDA special correspondent Captain Third Rank V. Yermolin: "Lithuania, 26 March"]

[Text] The green squares of fields, small wooded islands, and isolated farmsteads were clearly visible through the helicopter window. Our route lay between Lithuania and Kaliningrad Oblast. Our task, broadly speaking, was to monitor the territory. What prompted this overflight of the area?

It must now be frankly said that Lithuanian parliamentarians are moving away from theoretical separatist conclusions toward highly specific steps to set up subunits operating in parallel to the Soviet Army and border troops. The recruitment of volunteers for so-called regional defense detachments is now in full swing, every effort is being made to sabotage the surrender of arms, and desertion is being encouraged. On top of all this, Misiukonis, the Republic's internal affairs minister, announced from the rostrum of the Lithuanian Supreme Council [Verkhovnyy Sovet] that he is not subordinate to Soviet laws. I have already written about the public prosecutor and his notions on legality: He had no hesitation in swearing allegiance to "Sajudis" in the person of V. Landsbergis. The question arises: Who then will protect the rights of Soviet people in the republic?

Army General V. Varennikov, commander in chief of the Ground Forces and USSR deputy defense minister, who is currently in Lithuania, said at a meeting with a group of Soviet journalists that no one should be in any doubts about the force of Soviet laws in the Republic and that Soviet citizens should understand that their interests and their safety are reliably protected. Any attempts to create armed forces of the Lithuanian republic are absolutely illegal. Hence the attitude shown toward them on our part.

Here is one of the latest reports. In Kaunas unidentified persons hurled stones at a sentry guarding an installation: The sentry was Private E. Almakayev. It was only by pure good fortune that he got away with bruises. Incidentally, the soldier could have used weapons against his attackers. Regulations would have allowed him to do this. One can understand the sentry's restraint, because the people confronting him were teenagers. But what is the explanation for the inflammatory speeches of the grown men, who are provoking attacks like these with their irresponsible words? For example, A. Cekuolis, adviser to the republic Supreme Council and member of the "Sajudis" Seimas, recently said literally this on republic television: "Special troops have been sent into our republic: They will attack Soviet officers and their families so as to then lay the blame on us." It is hard to believe that you are dealing with a person with any common sense in this instance.

In Vilnius, Kaunas, everywhere I chanced to meet military people, I heard this question: "Why are USSR people's deputies and members of the Supreme Soviet not in evidence in Lithuania?" One can understand the anxiety felt by people in military uniform. The situation in the Republic is presently developing in the direction of rapidly mounting tension.

...Army General V. Varennikov visited the Ignalina Nuclear Power Station Monday. He met service personnel, answered questions—the guest was completely inundated with them—and gave his views on the situation in Lithuania.

Here in Lithuania people in army uniform are the ambassadors of the political and legal line of the Soviet Government and the USSR president.

Party Secretary Discusses Building Takeovers

LD2603150190 Moscow TASS in English 1440 GMT 26 Mar 90

[Text] Vilnius March 26 TASS—By TASS correspondent Kazys Uscila:

The situation in Lithuania is, for the most part, calm, although observers point to remaining tension. No rallies are being held, and all factories, government offices and organisations are operating.

Today's sitting of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet began with a report by President Vytautas Landsbergis, in which he described the current political situation in Lithuania as calm.

He dwelt in detail on the Army takeover of several buildings in the republican capital Vilnius. In the past three days, the Army occupied the city party committee, the higher party school and the political education centre.

Landsbergis informed deputies that the buildings were occupied at the request of the Lithuanian Communist Party (on the platform of the Soviet Communist Party) on the grounds that they were the "Soviet Communist Party's property".

In an interview with TASS, Miklos Burokiavicius, first secretary of the Provisional Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party (on the Soviet Committee of the Lithuanian Communit Party platform) stressed that the hard decision was adopted only after there was a real threat that these buildings would be occupied by various public organisations.

He also said the time-table of studies at the University of Marxism-Leninism, housed in the political education centre, and the higher party school has not been disrupted. Vilnius University, which leases premises at the political education centre, is also holding classes according to its schedule.

Republican television showed an episode featuring Army vehicles near the entrance to the Vilnius party school and armed troops inside its lounge.

A department for liaison with the Army, headed by Deputy Prime Minister Romualdas Ozolas, has been set up, it was officially announced here.

In a television appearance, a republican deputy interior minister said the police were accepting hunting rifles only from those citizens who voluntarily wished to hand in the weapons.

He emphasized that the police would not take part in "their forcible confiscation" and if "forced to do that, most policemen would leave."

Moscow on 'Untruthful Information' in Lithuania

LD2603121890 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 26 Mar 90

[Unattributed "Dispatch"]

[Text] Many people in Lithuania nowadays seem to have a dual mentality—what laws to follow, whose will to obey. On the one hand, the republic's parliament was legally elected and can't be ignored. But on the other hand, the acts of legislation the parliament has passed obviously run counter to the USSR Constitution. People want things to be definite and await sensible decisions from the Lithuanian politicians.

So far, with things uncertain, the time is ripe for rumors. For instance, there has been a strong rumor that the nuclear power plant near the city of Snieckus is surrounded with tanks to prevent someone blowing it up. Indeed, troops are guarding the station, but without any tanks. In the current situation in the republic guarding such an important installation is simply necessary, since the safety of the people is involved.

It's unfortunate that the local press is vigorously spreading untruthful information. But nothing is reported in it about attacks on munitions warehouses, or about a soldier having been stoned. It seems that the leaders of the republic and the police have stepped aside from solving problems of the people whom they regard subjects of another country, that is, the Soviet Union.

Alas, it's a reality that a statement has been made in the Lithuanian parliament that it's impossible to protect the social and legal interests of residents of the republic who oppose secession from the Federation.

Meanwhile representatives of the Soviet Interior Ministry have started helping the local police to remove firearms from citizens, to investigate and solve crimes, and to protect public order. Interior Ministry officers have already removed and placed in warehouses 5,500 pieces of firearms from organizations and agencies. Unfortunately, the demand that citizens should give up their firearms is not complied with everywhere. The commanding officer of the Baltic Border Region Troops Lieutenant General Gaponenko has described as very timely and concrete the edict of the national president, Mikhail Gorbachev, about additional measures to ensure the rights of Soviet citizens and to protect the Soviet Union's sovereignty on the territory of the Soviet Socialist Republic of Lithuania. Speaking about the activities of the border troops in these conditions, the general said that the border posts have been fortified.

On Sunday evening the Lithuanian leaders held an emergency meeting. Three army officers attended the meeting to represent the commander of the ground troops, General Valentin Varennikov. Prior to the meeting, Soviet paratroops had occupied two buildings in Vilnius belonging to the independent Communist Party of Lithuania. However, despite this move, the chairman of the Lithuanian parliament, Vytautas Landsbergis, has declared that he rules out military interference in Lithuania. A deputy minister of the interior in Lithuania, Vaclovas Zabarauskas, said that Sunday passed calmly in the republic in general. He said although that some media are covering the situation in the republic in a tendentious and one- sided way, he added this does not serve by far the cause of settling the difficult situation in Lithuania. [sentence as heard]

Brazauskas Interviewed on Situation in Lithuania

PM2503193190 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 25 Mar 90 pp 1-2

[Aleksandr Afanasyev dispatch, datelined Vilnius-Moscow, incorporating interview with Algirdas Brazauskas, first secretary of the autonomous Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee and deputy chairman of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Ministers; date, place of interview not specified: "Brazauskas Interviewed for KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA"; "What Was Said and What Remained Unsaid by the Secretary"]

[Text] On 22 March, when I was returning to Moscow, life in Vilnius appeared perfectly placid. The city's residents were doing whatever any large city's inhabitants do on ordinary days. There were neither demonstrations nor rallies. The largest crowds were to be seen in "wine" lines. Parliament was in continuous session in the city center, following a practice which is not unique to Vilnius alone. On the whole, things were quiet. Apart from the fact that someone, quoting someone he knows, remarked: Military hardware moved through the city overnight. Furthermore, eyewitnesses reported the appearance of soldiers in field camouflage uniform. Rumors, talk. It is said that an additional two or three military units have been moved to the republic. It is said that Russians in Snieckus have organized a civil disobedience campaign. Owners are worried by the USSR presidential decree: If you surrender expensive engraved weapons, are you likely to get them back? Jokes keep changing with the weather: Moscow has, in all likelihood, decided to disarm the high-ranking bureaucrats by ordering the surrender of hunting rifles... Joking apart, however, we were told that enterprises are forming detachments, while members of the indigenous population are enlisting as volunteers to guard the region's borders.

Drizzle was falling in Vilnius. The spring air, dominated by the winds of freedom a week or two ago, now seemed to carry different winds. The word independence has such a sweet sound to it. But different words can be heard increasingly often now: insolvency, nonrecognition, tension... The air seemed to be oppressively heavy, as when there are no signs of a thunderstorm but the soul yearns for some certainty, for some clarity. The newspapers carry suspicious headlines like: "Moscow. No Sound of Thunder Yet?" Western journalists are anticipating a sensation. V. Landsbergis, who was so determined and unbending on the day independence was proclaimed, is now scanning news reports from the Kremlin and the White House for any sign of encouraging hints. "...**Maybe** the USSR Government statement **indirectly** stresses..." "Some other elements of this statement **could be** perceived as **a highly original sign**..." "...**at** that time we did not hear any such **specially emphasized reaction**... issues which earlier seemed to be of small importance are now **interpreted strictly and firmly**, and I conclude that the USSR Government **perceives, senses, and in a certain fashion** recognizes the new juridical situation." (My emphasis here and subsequently—A.A.)

Signs. Hints. Guesswork. If they have started talking to us firmly, maybe they are taking us seriously?

This is certainly a new and somewhat discouraging tone. But why adopt it? Could it be due to lack of experience? Let us assume it is.

It seems that awareness is only now setting in: It is not enough to devise and adopt some 50 laws in just a week and a half, it is not enough to declare independence before the whole world.

Politicians are not dilettantes, they are perfectly well aware that a proclamation of independence is not the beginning but the outcome of a lengthy and painstaking process of coordinating and interlinking the interests of different sides.

People in Lithuania nowadays eagerly and frequently compare their situation to that in Namibia. Fine, this comparison pleases some people, and God be with them: After all, the last colonial regime in Africa has fallen! But the point is that it did not fall, the actual "fall" was prepared and was the result of a lot of joint work.

But in Lithuania? Not in Africa?

Let us recall the desperate afterburning effected at the moment the chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet was elected. No, nobody would dispute the formal legality of the election: With more of their own people, with their own people voting, the result was predictable. And yet, a respected Lithuanian philosopher, without beating about the bush, described the event as a **historic mistake.** "An irreparable mistake was made..." "It was clear even before the elections that Landsbergis' popularity was probably only half as great as the popularity enjoyed by A. Brazauskas among Lithuania's population..." "The new Supreme Soviet wields really great power. However, not the full power **to no longer take the voters' will into account** when taking its first step. Unless it is taken into account, things will go badly: **Most of its decisions will be left hanging in midair** and we will get that much closer to violence. A paradoxical situation, but this is why we have the ability to reason..."

The paradox is obvious: The alluring idea of independence emerges not as victor but as victim—a victim not to outside forces but to the haste of those who proclaimed it to the entire world. Not just a visiting observer but any sensible and solid indigenous resident of the republic would be entitled to think: Hold on, if we have declared that we are free, and yet nobody seems to completely believe it and everybody is persistently advising a "settlement" of relations with the USSR—is this not too high a price to pay for such independence?

The subsequent reasoning is simple. How independent can an independent government be if just a private telegram from some American woman of Lithuanian origin (to the effect that the U.S. Congress would not back the government if it were headed by a communist) results in a veritable coup: The elected premier was not Brazauskas, who had no wish to resign from the party "at this particular time," but Prunskiene, who had managed to hand in her party membership card in good time?... Is this really independence? Or just some oddity? And if it were some oddity, then consider the following oddities. What if this is not the last postal or telegraphic communication capable of creating a real storm in parliament and producing yet another reshuffle of the "independent" cabinet? The USSR presidential decree is not a valid decree for our chairman, the sensible and solid indigenous resident might notice. But why is it that our leader is so responsive to even private messages from another foreign state? Has our choice not gone a bit too far already? Is such responsiveness not dangerous and flippant? And ultimately, how consistent are those who promised freedom in exchange for the right to speak on the people's behalf?

Especially in view of the fact that this right, which was gained—and I emphasize this—in compliance with the law, is in places already beginning to be interpreted almost as a monopoly. The republic is silently observing, but conclusions are being drawn. For example, there was a wish to appoint a nonprofessional head of television and radio. The excuse was that the current leader was a communist. And "Sajudis" is supposedly... in the underground, as far as television is concerned. But hold on a minute, deputies spoke in unison: Seeing that "Sajudis" has several programs of its own on television, seeing that it is—to put it mildly—by no means the tiniest force here, what sort of "underground" are we talking about?!

The republic is observing, comparing, considering. Take for example a fresh—and resolute—move: To ban the relay of Central Television and Leningrad Television! The excuse? Exactly the same: "instigation," communist propaganda. Fine, the programs may not be to their liking. But the sensible and solid indigenous resident also has a good memory. And he recalls very well **the times** and **the regime under which** Voice of America was being jammed. Ah, but was that not under totalitarianism? Was that not a sign of ideological impotence, of the government's instability, of its bankruptcy? But what about now? But what about us?

The situation in the republic is not simple. A note of alarm has already sounded even in parliament. Something along the following lines was said from the parliamentary rostrum: I heard the word "autocracy" for the first time yesterday, I did not invent it, but I am afraid that it might prove productive in our case...

Yes, this is another word in circulation. "Autocracy" is defined in the dictionary of foreign words as "a system of management whereby one person wields unlimited supreme power."

Actually, there is no need for hasty conclusions in such a situation, the republic's residents themselves can work things out far better and much more reliably than we can. Especially in view of the fact that they increasingly often look up to the man whom—in the course of a sociological study conducted by the Gallup Institute—they placed above Thatcher, Bush, and the pope, never mind Landsbergis (he came fourth).

This man is Algirdas Brazauskas. An enigma of a man whom some describe as "an appeaser who has betrayed fundamental interests," others are inclined to see him as a bold reformer in the sphere of communist ideas, while yet others would like to see him as the nation's hope. Has he been cheated and outplayed in a ruthless political game? Is this man, equally versed in talking to Moscow and to his own compatriots, now finally demoted to playing a secondary role?

I wanted to ask him these and many other burning questions. But... Bearing in mind the complexity and incompleteness of the fast-moving political topic, we opted for a narrower subject of conversation. We spoke about a Communist Party which has actually given up its monopoly.

[Afanasyev] Esteemed secretary, how do you appraise the position of the autonomous Lithuanian Communist Party, its strength and its weaknesses, its chances, its prospects?

[Brazauskas] I am glad that you immediately and bluntly asked this question, a question which is profoundly perturbing for us, for our party comrades, and for many people who wish us well. We will examine it comprehensively and in detail at a forthcoming Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum on 26 March, and then at our party congress. But right now, and with the utmost certainty, I would like to say this: We perceive as correct the course taken by the republic party organization's 20th congress which created an autonomous Lithuanian Communist Party functioning on the basis of its own program and statutes.

There are people who, disregarding the fact that three months have already passed since the turbulent days of the 20th congress, are to this day trying to accuse us of having committed almost every single "mortal sin." But they do not take into account, and are altogether unwilling to comprehend, the fact that the entire course of sociopolitical development in the republic, and primarily the Lithuanian people's fast-growing national awareness, had by that time posed most sharply the question: Whose side are you on, Lithuanian communists? Are you with the people, striving for the restoration of an independent Lithuanian state; or are you against them?

We took up a firm stance and clearly chose the first path, which corresponded with the people's innermost aspirations.

As you know, the republic's new, democratically elected Supreme Soviet adopted a series of fundamentally important documents at its first session which laid the legal foundation for the de facto restoration of an independent Lithuanian state and its real functioning.

You know that members of the autonomous Lithuanian Communist Party are in the minority in this parliament's corps of deputies—there are only 40 of them. An even smaller number—only five deputies—express the position of the Communist Party "on the CPSU platform." This is due to a whole series of reasons. It can, however, be said with the utmost certainty: The ranks of communist deputies in the Lithuanian republic's present parliament would have been thinner still had it not been for the 20th Lithuanian Communist Party Congress decisions and their active implementation.

Since the political situation in Lithuania is complex, any talk about strong aspects in the positions of the autonomous Lithuanian Communist Party is problematical. I would like merely to note that it draws its strength from the people's sincere support. I am convinced that the autonomous Lithuanian Communist Party has, by means of its practical actions, repeatedly proved its profound loyalty to the people. We are fully resolved to share with them all the burdens and vagaries of the future.

[Afanasyev] What prompted your consent to become deputy chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers?

[Brazauskas] Probably the easiest answer to your question would be this: It was prompted by the reality of the circumstances. This was certainly so. Nonetheless, the main consideration was different. I can openly and honestly say: This decision of mine was prompted by the interests of serving my people in these highly complex conditions, by the sincere desire to dedicate my experience and knowledge to this cause. I am profoundly grateful to all who perceived this decision of mine in this spirit and supported me.

[Afanasyev] A rather delicate question, but please answer it if you can: Will the question of renaming the autonomous Lithuanian Communist Party arise in the immediate future and, in general, what are today's tactics in relations with other political forces?

[Brazauskas] Your question really is a delicate one. Primarily because it is very complicated to talk about the Lithuanian Communist Party's tactics in conditions of a really existing multiparty system. Especially since, as we believe, its tactics will change in line with sociopolitical changes.

The autonomous Lithuanian Communist Party's fundamental goal is to march together with the Lithuanian people, with all people in Lithuania. This is what will determine its specific practical steps.

The main point for us is to consolidate the democratic political forces so as to solve the urgent problems of all ethnic communities inhabiting Lithuania. As I already said, our ideal is an independent and democratic Lithuanian state. As for renaming the independent Lithuanian Communist Party, this question will be examined at the Lithuanian Communist Party congress. Even though it is extremely important, practical deeds still remain the mainfactor.

[Afanasyev] It is about two weeks since the new republic parliament started work, with 40 deputies representing the autonomous Lithuanian Communist Party. As far as I have noticed, these deputies have not yet taken a very active part in the debates. Why is this? What steps does the Communist Party intend to take in its new role?

[Brazauskas] As I have already said, a plenum of the autonomous Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee will be held Monday 26 March. It will determine our line.

[Afanasyev] Following your appointment as deputy chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers, do you intend to resign the post of first secretary of the autonomous Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee or, on the contrary, do you consider that it is not necessary to do so now?

[Brazauskas] No, I have no such intention. I will perform the duties of Central Committee secretary, since I was elected by the congress.

[Afanasyev] What line in mutual relations with Moscow is envisaged by A. Brazauskas, deputy chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers?

[Brazauskas] I think that, without changing anything fundamentally, we must honor our mutual commitments.

[Afanasyev] When you embarked on reforms in the party and society did you envisage that the initiative, together with power, would switch to other people at the decisive stage?

[Brazauskas] Yes, I did. To the extent, of course, that it was possible to do so in the fast-changing situation. Unfortunately, the situation was not favorable for the party in many respects—and primarily, as we are convinced, because the 20th party congress was held too late. The burden of the past is overwheleming. For us, this is a great lesson for the future... [Brazauskas ends]

As you can see, the esteemed secretary is not deviating from his usual style. His remarks are well-weighed and considered, and in some respects deliberately, even excessively, cautious. Who can tell what is better now: Unhurried, steady progress which would propel the republic slowly, but propel it nonetheless, into the future, or the recent desperate audacity which has brought about the present near desperate situation?

I am not saying this for the sake of a play on words. I am inclined to share the viewpoint of the respected Lithuanian philosopher Arvidas Yuozaytis who described the deputies' choice as a historic mistake. It is not a question of personalities—ultimately this is not our affair, it is for the inhabitants of Lithuania to decide whom they prefer. It is a question of specific policies. And their consequences. Ultimately it is a question of the fate of the republic. It is also of considerable importance what impact these policies have on the USSR and the world. It seems to me to be no accident that the philosopher is talking about a possible situation where decisions **are left hanging in midair.**

After all, this is already partly happening. It is very easy to switch off the television, but how is one to switch off the voters' awareness, if they—experienced, very experienced as they are—suddenly start suspecting: What if they are cutting off the Moscow channel because they are afraid of competition, because, essentially, they do not trust their voters?

How often has it been said from the rostrum of the republic's parliament that Australia is on the point of "recognizing us." But no, the Australian Government cooled, noting that the statement of its foreign minister had simply been misunderstood. The embassy explained: Australia welcomes any steps taken by Lithuania to achieve independence. However, so far it does not regard it as an independent state... How much credit in the eyes of the voters has their own parliament left after this?

Here is an example: Twelve leaders of union ministries sit down at the negotiating table not with the republic premier but with one of his [as published] deputies (A. Brazauskas): This is not just "rubbing salt into the wounds" of the voter, it is yet another reason for him to think: **Whom do they really take seriously in Moscow? After all, the "clarification" of relations with Moscow is what will determine the official reaction of the West.**

In general it seems that people here are beginning to attach more importance to relations with Moscow. I would not be surprised if, in time, V. Landsbergis, following the development of events, shifts from the radical wing closer to the center, closer to the positions of his more cautious rival. In any case, it seems that Landsbergis would very much like Moscow to sit down at an official negotiating table with his people (and consequently also with himself) as soon as possible.

The following idea has also been put about: If we succeed in getting Moscow to the negotiating table, this could be interpreted as de facto recognition of independence...

So what is the upshot? Should we refuse to enter into dialogue? No, of course not. But the question is: with whom, how, for the sake of what, and in what form?

I sat in parliament and listened to the arguments of one deputy on how enterprises can be removed from union jurisdiction. It is very simple. All you have to do is introduce a republic currency—the lit—in parallel with the ruble. Rubles will buy essential goods, while all the articles in short supply will be sold exclusively for the Lithuanian currency. After a short while the enterprise directors themselves will be begging to be removed from departmental jurisdiction. What about unemployment? Moscow will not allow it, it will definitely continue supplying raw materials. It will not allow unemployment!

Moscow needs to know this. It needs to know that they will talk to it not in the language of equability but in the language of strict accounting. And ultimately people "who know how to talk with Moscow" will be proposed for the talks...

Incidentally, this consideration may prove useful also to those "who know how to talk with Moscow." On one occasion this ability of theirs—for talks about "the interests of the nation"—has already been exploited, but when the emergency was over they were "shunted off" to play a secondary role.

It is true that there are quite a few nuances in the Lithuanian situation. However, this should in no circumstances prompt the conclusion: Why beat about the bush, has the time not come to use weightier, more incisive arguments? It must be realized that "heavy" arguments will only provoke the reverse result! The policy which was left hanging in midair will immediately, retrospectively, receive approval and backing. All this is well known: Fear means respect, but if they "attack," then it is necessary to "close ranks"...

...It was drizzling when I left Vilnius. There is nothing for it, the weather is unsettled at the moment, the Lithuanian colleagues who saw me off said. Both they, as

Lithuanians, and I, as a Russian, wanted not just a more settled situation. We wanted total clarity, both in matters of the sky and in earthly matters.

Yazov Says Problem Will Be 'Settled Peacefully'

AU2703133190 Paris AFP in English 1258 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Excerpts] Paris, March 27 (AFP)—Soviet Defence Minister Dmitriy Yazov said the situation in Lithuania would be resolved "peacefully" as he came out of a meeting here Tuesday with French Prime Minister Michel Rocard.

Asked about Soviet military intervention overnight Monday in three hospitals where Lithuanian deserters from the Red Army had been sheltering, General Yazov said: "The deserters must be taken back to their units."

But the minister added that he was not up to date "with the situation in Lithuania this morning" since "I left (Moscow) early." [passage omitted]

Gen. Yazov told reporters here that he was "working on the basis that the (Lithuanian secession issue) will be settled peacefully."

"I mean that there is no military action on Lithuanian territory," he added. "There are troops, there is the Baltic military region, but we have not used the Soviet Army."

There were no details of the 45-minute meeting the Soviet minister had with Mr. Rocard. Gen. Yazov had earlier been met at the airport by French Defence Minister Jean-Pierre Chevenement, with whom he also had brief talks before coming into Paris.

Gen. Yazov, on an official four-day visit to France, will visit the Navy at Toulon, the Army at Saumur and the Air Force at Reims.

Vilnius Radio Carries 26 Mar Council Session

Landsbergis Addresses Council

LD2603103790

Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0900 GMT on 26 March carries a live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius. The session opens with a 38-minute speech by V. Landsbergis, chairman of the Supreme Council.

Minister of Culture Appointed

LD2603113590

Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian continues its live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius. Following the speech by Supreme Council Chairman Landsbergis at 0940 GMT Kazimiera Prunskiene proposes Darius Kuolys for the post of minister of education and culture. Kuolys, a philologist, was born in Vilnius, Lithuania in 1962 and is a graduate of Vilnius University.

At 0948 GMT the commission for education and culture supports this candidature and the chairmen of other commissions agree.

At 0957 GMT Darius Kuolys presents his plans for education and culture stressing the importance of the creative force of culture, of the representation of Lithuanian culture abroad, and the return of Lithuanian cultural wealth from friendly and unfriendly countries. In his opinion, the aim of education is the development of cultured, free, and inventive personalities.

At 1004 GMT the deputies put their questions to the candidate.

At 1101 GMT a vote taken. By the majority of voters Kuolys is appointed minister of culture and education. The chairman of the session then announces that after lunch the deputies will work in committees and deputy clubs before continuing the session at 1330 GMT.

Power Supplies Discussed

LD2603162690

Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1330 GMT on 26 March continues its live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius.

At 1333 GMT the announcer says that during the interval the deputies discussed various problems in groups and commissions. There were also meetings with journalists.

At 1334 GMT the deputes register, Aleksandras Abisalas is in the chair. He states that a closed session should take place after all items on the agenda are exhausted. A report will be made at that session by the mandate and ethics commission.

At 1337 GMT a statement by the council on normal work of the enterprise, organizations, and offices is read. It is a repeat of the resolution adopted on 25 March by the Presidium of the Supreme Council.

At 1342 GMT the decision is adopted by a majority of votes. Following this, K. Prunskiene nominates a candidate for minister of fuel and power engineering, Leonas Vaidotas Asmontas, born in 1939, Lithuanian, Graduate of Moscow Institute of Power Engineering, doctor of technical sciences.

At 1347 GMT the chairmen of various commissions support the candidature of Asmontas.

At 1349 GMT the candidate speaks of various ways of obtaining fuel and power. In the future, Lithuania will obtain power generated by the Ignalina nuclear power station, and a possible blockade by the Soviet Union, as far as power is concerned, will not have a long- term effect. All alternatives on the supply of power should be considered.

At 1357 GMT Asmontas is questioned.

At 1426 GMT the candidature of Asmontas is debated.

At 1436 GMT Asmontas is confirmed as minister of fuel and power engineering by a majority of votes.

At 1439 GMT Kazimiera Prunskiene proposes Algimantas Nasvytis for minister of construction and town planning. He was born in 1930 in Kaunas, graduate of the Institute of Arts, artist-architect. He is Lithuanian, a Sajudis activist.

At 1443 GMT the chairmen of commissions support the candidature. Nasvytis presents his views concerning his future work.

At 1446 GMT questions are put to the candidate.

At 1513 GMT the candidature of Nasvytis is debated.

At 1520 GMT Algimantas Nasvytis is confirmed as minister of construction and town planning by a majority of votes.

At 1523 GMT Minister Misiukonis makes a statement announcing that the number of crimes is declining in the Republic, with the exception of thefts. He mentions some minor incidents not involving the Soviet Army. The militia does not intend to take part in the division of property between both communist parties in Lithuania. Deputies ask the minister various questions concerning law and order in the Republic.

At 1558 GMT the session adjourns until 0900 GMT 27 March.

Landsbergis Addresses 26 Mar Council Session

LD2603111390 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0905 GMT 26 Mar 90

[Speech by Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Supreme Council of the Lithuanian Republic, at the Supreme Council session in Vilnius—live relay]

[Excerpts] Hello, colleague deputies! The presence of the Armed Forces here in Lithuania has recently become an ever increasing factor in our political life. Earlier we were occasionally aware of this, or would mention it as an illegal fact which had not been agreed upon, saying that the presence of the Armed Forces was by no means justified and was based on the willful decisions of the Soviet Union alone, and people called it an occupational army—we also sometimes referred to it in the same way in our documents. Now a clear demonstration has been given to us to show that this is not so, that the Army makes its own decisions on what it has to do in Lithuania. Maybe the Army has some orders from the USSR Government on what it should do here in Lithuania. However, we do not know whether these are specific orders or mandates to carry out whatever the military leadership decides. When we ask about this, answers are not given.

Well, we have seen that these Armed Forces have embarked on carrying out some rather strange functions. They began to meddle in the dispute between political organizations over their property in Lithuania, as if the Army could serve as some sort of arbitrator, or as if a show of guns would provide one with more rights. Of course, this is the way one thinks over there in that country: that power gives you rights, which we can see quite often regarding what is done with respect to us.

But to show one's weapons over the ownership of a building in the belief that this would enforce someone's rights, well, this is all too reminiscent of some customs of the wild west.

When we saw that buildings were being occupied and that armed guards appeared there who did not allow civilians to enter these buildings and work there and so forth, the situation became very confusing. How far was this going to go; what other buildings could be occupied later?

The servicemen who were there told us themselves that they were guarding the buildings that were the property of the CPSU. Later, late last night, when we met with the leaders of the Vilnius garrison—they were already representing not only Vilnius garrison but also the high-ranking military leadership sent to Lithuania, even Commander of the Ground Forces Army General Varenninkov himself, who sent them to the talk as the representatives of the Armed Forces—the explanation given was indeed very simple. The buildings are being occupied at the request of the Lithuanian CPSU branch provisional Central Committee.

When asked if any other political or public organization had asked the Armed Forces to help them to acquire buildings or premises, would the Army then render their help also, no specific answer—yes or no—was given. It looks as if such cases are also possible in our interesting life today.

Nevertheless we are concerned that if the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee's buildings and some buildings of other organizations are taken by the military, it is possible, for example, that this building could also be taken by assault. We succeeded in obtaining assurances that last night no more buildings would be occupied. Today maybe an explanation has already been given regarding the nature of the list of claims on which the Soviet Armed Forces are helping to obtain satisfaction, because yesterday there was no clear answer whether the list of claims has already been exhausted by the occupation of those three buildings which you already know, the building of the former city party committee, the building of the former Higher Party School, which had been subordinated to the Teachers' Training Institute, and the House of Political Education.

Of course, we could ignore these interparty problems, in whose solution the military forces of the Soviet Union are somehow strangely involved. However, we must take it seriously because any such semi-conflict can turn into a physical conflict between people. We do not need this indeed, and it is not clear whether this is someone's aim, because some details of it indicate that maybe a certain recurring scenario is required to create a state of uncertainty and fear. In a threatening atmosphere people may begin to prepare to defend themselves, and then these people would be blamed because they want to or can defend themselves. Demands in advance for the surrender of hunting guns, air rifles, pistols used for teaching, and anything used for sports and instruction implied: look, this is where the danger lies; the danger is not the armored columns but the little pistols or two-barrelled hunting guns. Thus, attempts are made to create an impression that the situation is rather like that in the Caucasus where indeed many private persons are armed. So any political tension over there is much more dangerous.

Consequently, because information is being blocked, distorted information is being given about Lithuania to provide justification for the declaration of a state of emergency, or the use of military force when the pretext for this is not good enough. So the political pressure, the war of nerves can be not only a feature of the political game, it can be preparation and waiting for some sort of provocations.

One of those strange things is the announcements that have appeared in some places, which say that allegedly Lithuanian volunteers are called to a rally or a meeting in Vilnius, apparently today. You know, as well as anyone who wants to know, very well that my response to M. Gorbachev explained that the initiative to register people who are prepared in case of a need to intervene and help to maintain public order is not to set up specific units, the more so because to set up some kind of military unit is out of the question, but there is a desire to impute this to us. So this invitation to the volunteers who, in fact, do not exist, this invitation to a rally in Vilnius is an anonymous initiative. It is not the idea of the Council of Ministers or of the Supreme Council of Sajudis. It looks very much as if someone else wants it for very different objectives.

Therefore, in addition to what was already said yesterday on television, I would like to add my personal warning and advice not to gather in crowds and not to take part in such a rally, not to give any pretext that could be interpreted as if we are creating a threat to anyone. We have to be very careful in the media as well.

When an official commentator speaks on television about the Russian Army, or the Red deluge, especially identifying the units of the Soviet Armed Forces with one particular nationality, this should not be done and should not be tolerated, because this will be turned into a reproach to the whole republic.

Now what is our political situation like in the perspective of the USSR problem? Lithuania is a problem of the USSR inherited from Stalinist times, and the ways of peacefully resolving that we proposed met with a very broad response in various republics of the Soviet Union. In many places mass meetings in support of Lithuania were organized. In Russia democratic organizations gave their support by sending their delegations or texts of support.

Unfortunately, this kind of understanding and support was not given by the country's top leadership. M. Gorbachev did not sign the ill-fated decision adopted by the Third Congress of the USSR People's Deputies in which unfounded sovereignty claims are made over the land that was occupied in 1940.

However, some later documents indicate that he was implicated in a certain uneasy diplomatic situation in which it is not so easy to start negotiations with Lithuania. It seems that we must look for some formula. Now it is undoubtedly a question of dialogue, about clarifying the situation. Some dialogue is taking place through our delegates in Moscow at which certain viewpoints are being exchanged. Well, after all the civilized world is waiting for and urging a start of negotiations.

This has recently been done by Pope John Paul II, and French President Mitterrand. The tone from the White House in Washington is also rather definite; a warning was even given to the effect that the Soviet Union has violated the pledges given earlier not to use force and not to threaten with force. However, these threats and pressures are rather obvious.

So we see from this that maybe we will not have to wait very long before this dialogue will have to begin in a more direct form.

However, efforts to torpedo this possibility in advance can be seen in the central press. Thus, KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA terms our desire to start official negotiations as an attempt to bring Moscow to the negotiation table which could then be interpreted as recognition. We are not trying to force anyone to do anything. We only see how matters should be resolved, and the whole world sees that these matters should be resolved in this way and not in any other way.

However, one of the central newspapers yet again joins what I would call the pressure by some reactionary strata on Mikhail Gorbachev, so that he will not start negotiations. In other words, it makes his diplomatic situation more difficult, which is not easy as it is, and after all we should also understand this. We should not heap reproaches on M. Gorbachev for not having started negotiations with us immediately the next day.

The central press is looking hard for some discord among us. They are seeking opportunities to introduce schisms. The same paper I mentioned widely comments on and cites from the article by Arvydas Juozaitis, expressing of course their solidarity with the article for giving a true-to-life evaluation of the events. They are looking for specific facts, say, for example that representatives from all-Union ministries who arrived in this republic had talks on specific economic issues not with Kazimiera Prunskiene, the prime minister, but with her deputy, Algirdas Brazauskas. I believe that this was agreed upon between them and their functions were shared. However, it was stressed at once: Who is the person who has weight in Moscow and with whom we are going to sort out our relationship? There is a certain desire to introduce a split in our work and into the top leadership of our government.

We must also always be prepared for that just as much as we should be prepared for distortions and insinuations.

Peculiar things are emerging in the treatment of some aspects of our sovereignty. Here is an announcement by TASS that the USSR diplomatic corps and consulates have been entrusted with the task of applying order of permits for those going to Lithuania. In other words, I think these will be permits issued on a selective basis and not just anyone who wants to get a visa will be granted one without delay.

It means the Soviet Union usurps the right not only to issue visas, and a considerable income of hard currency from it, but also it usurps the right to make a selection who can be allowed to go to Lithuania and who cannot.

According to the above TASS announcement, the Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs has been informed that the USSR has now cancelled the simplified formality of crossing the Soviet-Polish border without a visa.

Well, there are people who have relatives on both sides of the border and to whom it is important to be able to have regulations as simple as possible. The impediment on this is a humanitarian aspect of Soviet policy which can be asssessed accordingly by people not only living here, but those in Poland as well.

However, concerning the Soviet-Polish border, this is one of the main political problems, in other words, the main problem of sovereignty. By unfounded assertion that this is the border of their state, one wants to go on proving what cannot be proven.

On the same day, John Matlock, U.S. ambassador, published his statement. He said that we recognize all other borders of your country, except the Baltics. This is a very clear confrontation of these claims that borders of Lithuania are the borders of the USSR. And he clearly says why, as all democratic countries remember that in 1940 forced annexation took place and therefore these borders are also forced borders.

So, we will have before us a constitutional-juridical aggression being carried out against us which we opposed by the apprehension of our rightness and by expressing it in our laws and Constitution. We must be prepared for such threats similar to the insinuations by the well-known newspaper KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, which say that a state of law and order should renounce anarchy and, of course, put its house in order.

And yet again the same question arises: Are we in this house?

Well, we are not. And of course a state of law and order should not cause a legal anarchy, it should not urge the people of Lithuania to disobey the laws of Lithuania. Unfortunately, it does this. And we are in a situation, which it seems could be artificially aggravated, where only Lithuanian laws legally apply it is declared as though other laws are also valid in Lithuania. People are torn in two parts and in the end they do not know whose laws they are breaking and who will issue proceedings against them.

Therefore, we should make it absolutely clear. Perhaps you heard about the provisional decision made by the Supreme Council Presidium. [passage omitted]

If I may, I would like to give some attention to a problem which is, I would say, a problem of relations between the parties, but in our conditions is an important political problem in Lithuania.

Yet again in the central press Professor Valentinas Lazutka—he is the author from Lithuania who gives his service, therefore lending certain credibility to the article—elucidates that the Lithuanian Communist Party is currently led by the Sajudis, because almost half of the leaders of the party are from Sajudis and so on. The rest is the interpretation known well to us: how such bad things can happen in Lithuania and how they were carried out. [passage omitted] With the help of the Army one can get a lot of things. If the Armed Forces can help to get the building back, perhaps these Armed Forces can help to get the power back. Because it was said: Well, we were asked and we are rendering our help. The role of the Army here in Lithuania based on such a criteria is very dangerous. Perhaps it is a danger to international peace. We know that it was said from very lofty rostrums abroad that if force is used against the legal parliament and government, the whole process of peace in Europe and the world will be pushed further back. It involves a question of the Army's needing it. Or perhaps it does need it? Perhaps then it will be important and vital again? It will again receive major subsidies from the Soviet state. Perhaps that is why it acts in this manner. However, as I have said, we do not know if it indeed is fully subordinated to the political leadership.

Here is the paper you may have seen, the newspaper that was published abroad and brought to Lithuania for distribution—I do not know to what extent it has been disseminated. It was prepared in advance and appeared as the organ of the Lithuanian Communist Party. Leaders of the Lithuanian Communist Party with whom I had the opportunity to get in touch yesterday said they did not publish any such newspaper. This is not their paper. This means there exists another political force that is usurping even the name of the party. It can be that even greater confusion is introduced by this in the people's minds. Perhaps it is intended to induce the Lithuanian Communist Party to renounce its name, by tearing this name from their hands already. Moreover, if this force inimical to Lithuania wants it so much, then it behooves the Lithuanian Communist Party to consider whether it would be worthwhile to surrender that name, which they so strongly seek. Of course this is the party's own affair. However, an outsider can express an opinion on that.

One of the greatest concerns of this newspaper which I had the occasion to glance through centers on the law concerning political parties which is being drafted here. This law is becoming more pressing every day. I think we should hasten its preparation and adoption. Perhaps the Legal Commission, as well as other commissions, could think more about it, so that we have it absolutely clear what a legal, lawful, legally registered political party is, and what is some group that calls itself a party or is not a party but only a local branch of another party not even based in Lithuania. These are our parliamentary problems, problems of legislation. I have mentioned the decision that should be adopted today which concerns certain articles in the Criminal Code, and political parties and their activities as defined by law.

Perhaps I will finish here. Perhaps there will be more information coming today and perhaps you will then give me some minutes to share this information with you.

Supreme Council Appoints Lozoraitis as Envoy

LD2703090290 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 26 Mar 90

[Report by correspondent Edvinas Butkus]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] Here is one more episode from last Friday night when the clamorous soldiers were inevitably approaching Vilnius. Then it seemed it was the critical moment and the Supreme Soviet adopted a decision on plenipotentiaries of Mr. Stasys Lozoraitis. The decision says: Bearing in mind the agressive attitude of the USSR toward the Republic of Lithuania, and that actions of the Republic of Lithuania Supreme Council in its present composition—which has been elected through free elections—can be restricted by acts of violence; and in order to freely express the will of the nation, the republic of Lithuania Supreme Council decides to appoint Mr. Stasys Lozoraitis representative of the independent Republic of Lithuania and special envoy to Washington and the Holy Sea.

Lithuanian Coordinating Council Proposed

LD2603164490 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1523 GMT 26 Mar 90

[Speech by Marijonas Misiukonis, Lithuanian minister of internal affairs, at the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius—live]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] Since contacts with representatives of the military authorities have been of an incidental character, yesterday the Ministry of Internal Affairs proposed that the Republic's leaders organize a coordinating council which would include representatives of the military authorities, the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the State Security Committee and the republican procuracy. Such a coordinating council was today approved by the government and we hope that in this way we will be able to solve possible misunderstandings or conflicts. I think it would be expedient for such a council to operate for a extended period of time. [passage omitted]

Landsbergis Appeals to Russians in Lithuania

LD2603221790 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 26 Mar 90

[Text] Late this evening, Chairman of Lithuania's Supreme Council Vytautas Landsbergis made an address in Russian on Lithuanian TV. It was meant for the Russian-speaking residents of Lithuania. Vytautas Landsbergis appealed to them to stay calm and not to yield to provocation. In particular the people were urged not to attend tomorrow's rally outside the building of the Supreme Council, which is organized by the pro-Moscow (?Jednocz) movement. He assured them that all citizens of Lithuania have always been and will ever be granted equal rights.

General Outlines Army's Tasks in Lithuania

LD2603155190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 26 Mar 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Presenter] Here is a report which we have only just received from Vilnius. The situation in that republic [Lithuania] is not only of interest to all of us, but is attracting attention from abroad, too.

[Correspondent P. Orlov] This is Kaunas, Lithuania's second most important city. It was here that our small group of Soviet journalists had the chance to meet and talk to Colonel General Ochalov, a paratroop commander.

[Begin recording] [Unidentified journalist] So what is going on at the moment? It is said that these are exercises, or are there some special troop movements being undertaken.

[Ochalov] Yes, these are run-of-the-mill, preplanned exercises. It is planned combat training. There are no additional programs to build up the disposition of troops. It is just that there are some people who are trying to capitalize on this.

[Orlov] As we learned, currently each day several dozen paratroop soldiers and officers are flying over the border of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] in helicopters, because there are more and more indicators that the so-called Forces for the Protection of the Country set up by Sajudis are erecting new border markers in circumvention of the law.

[Ochalov] All of this activity is, of course, uncharacteristic of us. We have been obliged now to become involved in the need to confiscate weapons. You know that, by decree of our president, all weapons must be confiscated within seven days. We know all about weapons from Baku and other regions. So far this matter is being resolved only slowly, but in the long run these weapons should be assembled in our depots. But today it may be said that, apart from the military, nobody is dealing with this. [end recording]

[Orlov] The army on the territory of Lithuania is continuing to carry out fastidiously the orders of the USSR president and government.

When we returned that same day to the Republic's capital we came across soldiers outside the building of the Vilnius Higher Party School. Supporters of the Communist Party of Lithuania on the CPSU platform had taken up residence here. There are genuine fears in the city that there could be disturbances here.

Other public buildings and the streets are patrolled by militia officers. Unfortunately, this does not indicate an elementary divison of functions. It merely goes to show that, as before, mutual trust is still a long way off.

First Issue of Communist Party Organ Published

LD2703084890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0655 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, 27 Mar (TASS)—SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA today reports that the first issue of the newspaper SOVETSKAYA LITVA, organ of the republic's Communist Party on the CPSU Platform, has just come out.

A correspondent from the newspaper interviewed the editor-in- chief of SOVETSKAYA LITVA S. Joniene. She said: "The paper is to be the organ of the Communist Party of Lithuania—so says a message from the editorial team to readers. We do not use the words 'on the CPSU Platform', but this is not because we do not recognize the platform. Rather it is because we do not need any kind of additions or clarifications to the party's name. Those who do need such things are the so-called "reorganized CPL, [Communist Party of Lithuania] which in its program documents and activities has all but wholly repudiated Marxist-Leninist ideology and philosophy, emasculated its internationalist substance and fallen under the thumb of arrant nationalists and apologists for the bourgeois system.

We are for the sovereignty of Lithuania, for it standing on its own feet politically, economically, and culturally and we consider that this can be attained together and painlessly only within the make-up of a renewed union of USSR on the basis of a new treaty."

The eight-page broadsheet SOVETSKAYA LITVA contains many pertinent publicistic pieces written by people from the first secretary of a republican Communist Party Central Committee to workers and veterans of the party or the Great Patriotic War who lay before their fellow citizens their pain and their truth.

According to the editor-in-chief the paper is needed not only by those communists who have remained true to not only internationalism but also to hundreds and hundreds of thousands of people who are reluctant to follow a bourgeois nationalist government and do not want the republic to break with the Soviet Union. And there are more and more such people in Lithuania every day. The Lithuanian people are beginning to realize quite clearly that they have been duped. Sajudis came out with slogans about perestroyka and democracy, but the fact is that in one day they changed the Constitution and now they are in a rush because they realize that their position is very shaky. What is important for them now is to shackle the people as quickly as possible with the chains of antidemocratic laws and juridically suppress any kind of dissidence so as to keep themselves in power.

"Our newspaper will help to rally all healthy forces in the republic and stand up for people's rights and freedoms and for Soviet power. Once again we have to really fight for Soviet power in Lithuania. And for this, to quote Lenin, a political newspaper is needed."

Editor Interviewed

PM2703094590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 27 Mar 90 Second Edition p 1

[Interview with Candidate of Historical Sciences S. Yuonene, editor in chief of SOVETSKAYA LITVA, by special correspondent S. Shevtsov; date and place of interview not specified, under the rubric "Our Special Correspondent Reports from Lithuania": "Return to Truth. After a Long Break the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU Platform) Has Its Own Press Organ"; first two paragraphs are editorial introduction; last four paragraphs are conclusion]

[Text] Sajudis is cunning. While assuring the country's president through the mouthpiece of its leader V. Landsbergis that "Lithuania's citizens have been guaranteed defense of their rights and freedoms," it is urgently drafting a law whereby it is intended to put dissenters away for a long time. The draft law was scheduled to be discussed 27 March. The first issue of SOVETSKAYA LITVA—the organ of the republic's Communist Party (CPSU platform)—has just been published.

We met Candidate of Historical Sciences S. Yuonene, editor in chief of SOVETSKAYA LITVA, at Vilnius' Oktyabrskiy Party Raykom [Rayon Party Committee].

[Shevtsov] You know, even in Smetona's bourgeois Lithuania there wasn't such a harsh law as this present draft. That's the kind of people that have come to power.

They are speaking on behalf of the people. But they are saying nothing. Yet communists spent time in jail in bourgeois Lithuania...

[Shevtsov] Are you preparing for the worst?

[Yuonene] Sajudis is not playing games. It has frequently proved this and will prove it again.

[Shevtsov] Consequently, SOVETSKAYA LITVA also has a hard time ahead?

[Yuonene] These difficulties have already begun. We are forced to print the newspaper outside the republic. I consider that to be a disgrace to Sajudis. While verbally proclaiming pluralism, it has seized all the mass media in the republic and is engaged in unprecedented massive indoctrination of people's consciousness. Everyone who disagrees in some way with Sajudis is being denigrated. Under these conditions thousands and thousands of people have telephoned us from various parts of the republic, sent cables, and asked us the following question during personal meetings: "When will the communists have their own newspaper?!" You realize that it is not only the communists who have remained true to internationalism who need this organ, but also the hundreds and hundreds of thousands of people who do not want to follow a bourgeois nationalist government and who do not want the republic to split with the Soviet Union. And these people are growing in numbers in Lithuania every day. The Lithuanian people are beginning to clearly realize that they have been deceived. Members of Sajudis appeared with slogans of perestroyka and democracy, while they in fact changed the Constitution overnight; they are in a hurry since they realize that their positions are very shaky. It is important for them to shackle the people by antidemocratic laws and suppress any dissent by law and thus retain their position in power.

Our newspaper will help all the healthy forces within the republic to rally together and uphold people's rights and freedoms and Soviet power. As you can see, we must once again really fight for Soviet power in Lithuania. To use Lenin's words, we need to organize a political newspaper to do this.

[Shevtsov] How will SOVETSKAYA LITVA reach its readers?

[Yuonene] It is impossible to do this in the traditional manner, via the Main Administration for the Distribution of Printed Matter. We need permission to print the newspaper from the Sajudis censors, yet the censors say: "You first need permission to register your party." Yet our party was registered in 1940, it was born in 1918. We also need official authorization from Sajudis to distribute the newspaper. That is why we will circulate it via party organizations with the help of workers, just as was done during the Communist Party's underground activity.

[Shevtsov] Who is publishing the newspaper with you?

[Yuonene] They are all people of most varied specialisms and nationalities—Russians, Lithuanians, Jews, Poles. Incidentally, we plan to publish the newspaper in three languages—Russian, Lithuanian, and Polish. But here is another paradox: In a republic where the Lithuanian language has been declared the state language, we cannot publish a newspaper in this state language. Must we really turn to Belorussia or Russia for assistance?

[Shevtsov] How regular do you intend the newspaper to be?

[Yuonene] Until we have overcome all manner of difficulties—the editorial office has no premises nor the full complement of staff—the newspaper will be weekly. Then we hope to publish it five times a week. But under the kind of "democracy" offered by Sajudis who knows what will happen to us tomorrow? [Yuonene ends]

"The newspaper is the organ of the Lithuanian Communist Party—the editorial collegium's address to the readers says. "We are not excluding the words 'on the CPSU Platform' because we do not acknowledge this platform. We do not need any additions to or explanations of the party's name. They are necessary for the so-called 'reorganized' Lithuanian Communist Party, whose program documents and activity have virtually totally renounced Marxist-Leninist ideology and philosophy, emasculated its international essence, and fallen under the sway of rank nationalists and apologists for the bourgeois system.

"We advocate sovereignty for Lithuania, political, economic, and cultural independence for it. We consider that we can only achieve this together and without pain within a renewed USSR on a new treaty basis."

The eight-page broadsheet edition of SOVETSKAYA LITVA contains may vehement commentaries, whose authors—ranging from the first secretary of the republic's Communist Party Central Committee to workers and veterans of the party and the Great Patriotic War—make sincere and passionate appeals full of pain and truth to their fellow citizens.

It has become known that V. Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet has signed a decree "On Criminal Responsibility for Antistate Appeals" without a preliminary discussion at the republic's parliament.

Lithuanian Central Committee Plenum Opens

LD2603135190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1335 GMT 26 Mar 90

[Text] Vilnius, 26 Mar (TASS)—A plenum of the Independent Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee opened today in Vilnius. Algirdas Brazauskas, first secretary of the party Central Committee, delivered a report on the role and place of the Communist Party in present-day conditions, now that Communists have lost the leading positions in the republic's parliament and government. The structure of the Central Committee's secretariat and other issues on the future activity of this political organization will be examined at the plenum, too.

More on Plenum

LD2703084690 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 26 Mar 90

[Excerpts] Today a plenum of the independent Lithuanian Communist Party Central Commmittee took place in Vilnius. The situation of the Lithuanian Communist Party in the republic of Lithuania, directions of party activities after the declaration of the independent state of Lithuania, the structure of the secretariat of the Central Committee, and other issues were discussed.

Algirdas Brazauskas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, presented a report. [passage omitted]

It was proposed by the first secretary to consider a possible change in the party's name. [passage omitted]

Organizational questions also were discussed. Kestutis Zaleckas, former first secretary of Vilnius city party committee, and Romualdas Ozolas, were relieved as members of the Central Committee Bureau. [passage omitted]

S. Simkus director of the Higher Party School occupied by the Soviet troops, went on a hunger strike in protest at this excess. I would like to remind you that last week officials from the CPSU Central Committee arrived in Moscow and released him from the post of rector with the consent of Mr. Burokevicius, provisional first secretary of the Lithuanian CPSU. V. Lazutkas was given the post.

Lithuanian Communist Parties Meet, View Situation

LD2603211690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 26 Mar 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video report by V. Dvinin in Vilnius]

[Text] A conference of the leadership of the Communist Party of Lithuania on the platform of the CPSU with first secretaries of town and rayon party organizations took place in Vilnius today.

Mikolos Burakevichus, first secretary of the temporary Central Committee, who spoke at the conference, stated that the present leadership in the republic is conducting an antisocialist and in essence an anti-Soviet course. In order to restore the operation of USSR laws in Lithuania, in the view of Burakevichus, it is now essential to start forming citizens' committees at enterprises and establishments, in rayons and towns. Created on a broad public basis, drawing in all progressive forces, these committees will be called on to take on the protection of citizens of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]. Practical questions were also discussed at the conference concerning preparation for the Congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party on the platform of the CPSU, which is planned for 21 April. That was in the first half of the day.

In the second half of the day a plenum of the independent Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee opened. First Secretary Algirdas Brazauskas ascertained in his report that the party has lost the elections and found itself in a minority in the new composition of the republic's parliament. He admitted that a significant number of communists have left the ranks of the Communist Party of Lithuania and that this process is continuing. Now 86,000 members reamin in the party. Many communists, in Brazauskas's view, are waiting for the 28th CPSU Congress in order to make a final choice. The rapporteur proposed that there should be some thought given to a new name for the party. In speeches there was frank talk about transforming it into a social democratic union. A number of plenum participants expressed alarm at far from democratic methods with which the supporters of Sajudis are establishing their power in the republic. The plenum considered a new structure for the party apparatus which will have just over 50 persons. There will not be enough of them, perhaps, for this impressive building, but the independent Communist Party of Lithuania obstinately does not want to share premises with communists of the other party, who today came to the Central Committee building where the plenum took place.

Look at how it was: [video shows demonstration participants and their banners in close-up; one banner reads "Lithuania without the USSR, a Lithuania without a future"; another banner reads: "No place in the party home for CPSU dissenters"]

[Unidentified demonstrator in midsentence]... that there should be a referendum on the question of leaving the composition of the USSR. The present leadership which is ruling at the moment is against a referendum. It does not want to hold one because this government has been elected by about 43 percent of the electorate. The rest did not take part in the election campaign, and to talk on behalf of the entire people, as the republican leadership now states, is outside the scope of its authority.

[Second unidentified demonstrator] First and foremost we are the people, and the working people, always, at all times and in all periods have lived harmoniously, and now a small group of people has begun to split up all the ethnic groups.

Lithuanian Premier on Independence, Conflict

AU2603154390 Hamburg DIE WELT in German 26 Mar 90 p 5

[Interview with Lithuanian Premier Kazimiera Prunskiene by Manfred Rowold in Vilnius on 24 March; "Transition Will Take Years"]

[Text] Lithuanian Premier Kazimiera Prunskiene does not see any reason to change the policy of independence. In Vilnius, DIE WELT correspondent Manfred Rowold held an interview with the head of government, who is a professor of economics.

[Rowold] Over the past days you have had to get used to an escalation of the war of nerves. During Friday-Saturday night [23-24 March] armored vehicles with more than a thousand Soviet soldiers circled the parliament building. What, do you think, will be the next step?

[Prunskiene] These tanks are a signal by Moscow that they are prepared to act harshly and without compromises. We, for our part, are still of the opinion that our existence as a state is already legally founded. And we will try in fact to achieve this existence as a state, through negotiations with Moscow. Unfortunately, Moscow does not yet accept such negotiations. Today's reports from our deputies in Moscow are not particularly favorable, not particularly optimistic for us. This is also shown by the maneuvers here in Lithuania and the large number of tanks from last night, which are now here in Vilnius. Today the ultimatum to our young people to return to the Army, which they have left, expires.

[Rowold] How many have already been arrested?

[Prunskiene] There are already some reports, but I do not yet have any exact figures. Moscow has warned us that it will intensify such actions as of today. It is difficult to predict what these soldiers and tanks will do. We think that this was only an aggressive warning. We hope that Moscow will not really assume such an aggressive attitude.

[Rowold] You are pushing ahead the formation of a government so that it is made easier for other states to recognize Lithuania. Are you disappointed by the reaction of the West so far?

[Prunskiene] Yes, we are pushing ahead, because we quickly need a complete government, not only for the West but particularly for negotiations with Moscow. Our expectations as regards the West have always been realistic. We knew that the Western countries would not recognize us so quickly and so simply. The West watches what is going on in Lithuania, and it has a positive attitude toward us, but it does not hurry to recognize us. We think that warnings by Western countries to Moscow would be a very important aid for the beginning of negotiations on the easing of tensions in the relations between Lithuania and Moscow, a strengthening of our position toward Moscow. We have already heard such statements from Bush and from U.S. senators, and we are pleased about this. Full recognition, that is, not only de facto recognition in concrete spheres of relations, but de jure recognition, is not yet adequate. We do not yet have a complete government and we have very little control over some spheres of the republic. We hope that things will develop.

[Rowold] Is the Moscow draft law, which envisages a transitional period of five years for secession from the Soviet Union, a basis for negotiations for you? Or do you still think that you have never belonged to the Soviet Union as a matter of law?

[Prunskiene] Yes, we will not change our position, because we have no reason to do so. Our legal position is linked with the non-recognition of our incorporation into the Soviet Union. Therefore, the law on the secession from the Soviet Union does not apply to our current situation. We have restated our existence as a state and have legally fixed this under international law. We stick to this position—in negotiations with Moscow and in our relations with Western countries. Otherwise, we would lose the basis for the interpretation of what is the independent Lithuanian republic today.

[Rowold] Thus, the confrontation continues. There are voices in Lithuania that prefer the transition regulation and also want to dare a formal secession.

[Prunskiene] We can look at this question only within the framework of de facto independence: What do the further relations of the already independent republic with the Soviet Union mean? We will certainly continue to be linked very closely for some years, this we can see as a transitional period. We will coordinate our development programs, we will have treaties. Our main partner will be in the East, this is clear. But from the very beginning, Moscow must see us as a negotiating partners and not, as at present, as a subordinate territory.

[Rowold] When the tanks approached parliament at night, the deputies expected the works, including their arrest.

[Prunskiene] We hope that there is no such danger to parliament. Today a deputy who came from Moscow told us that there our parliament is recognized, but it is recognized only as the parliament of the Soviet Republic of Lithuania.

[Rowold] Thus, you need not fear being arrested.

[Prunskiene] We hope so.

Christian Democratic Party Registers in Lithuania

LD2603162290 Moscow TASS in English 1609 GMT 26 Mar 90

[Text] Vilnius March 26 ELTA-TASS—The Lithuanian government has registered a new party, the Lithuanian Christian Democratic Party.

Egidjus Klumbys, a doctor from Kaunas and people's deputy of the USSR, was elected chairman of the party board.

The Christian Democratic Party's thirty chapters around the republic unite more than 1,500 members.

Documentary Explores History of Baltic States

LD2303095590

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2010 GMT on 22 March carries a one-hour documentary entitled "Back in 1940", written and produced by Boris Sheynin, on the background and history of the Soviet incorporation of the Baltic states in 1940.

The program examines whether the Soviet move into the Baltic states of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia in 1940 was really an "occupation", or whether in fact the incorporation of these three countries into the USSR was welcomed and approved by their citizens. The first section of the film traces the historical background of the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact of 1939, which led to the take over. This is illustrated by archive film and interviews with Soviet and British historians and interspersed with film of a Baltic emigres' rally held in Bonn last year.

The program includes an interview with Col. Gen. Kleymenov, deputy chief of the General Staff of the Soviet Army, which runs as follows:

[Presenter] "Anatoliy Nikolayevich, during our travels in the Baltic republics and abroad we often heard claims that an occupation of the Baltic republics took place in 1940. As a military man, what can you say about this?

[Kleymenov] "Well, what is an occupation? An occupation occurs when armed forces seize enemy territory and take over its administration. On the part of the Soviet Union and the Red Army, no such thing did not take place. No such thing could have taken place. After the German seizure of Poland in 1939, the Soviet Union could not stand aside. It decided—it asked a number of friendly neighbors, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania—to conclude a pact and, in this way, to create a grouping. It did so to ensure that our state was not caught unawares. This pact was signed by the four states. In accordance with the pact, small units of the Red Army were moved into the Baltic republics and were deployed there. The units were deployed in accordance with a decision taken by these republics."

Kleymenov shows a map hanging on the wall and continues:

"This 50-year old map, which was declassified recently, shows that when the infantry corps were moved into the Baltic republics, their task was to cover the state frontier. These tasks are outlined here. The division was given sections of the state frontier to cover."

He points to another map and goes on: "Here is another similar map, showing the section of the state frontier which the 11th infantry corps had to cover. Many orders issued by the People's Commissar for defense quite clearly show the arrangements under which all members of the Red Army, beginning with top officers and ending with ordinary soldiers, were deployed there. One of the orders—order No. 0162 of the People's Commissar for Defense—says: All men of our units must clearly understand that, in accordance with the pact on mutual assistance, our units are stationed and will live on the territory of a sovererign state and they have no right to interfere in its political affairs or social system.

"So, in actual fact, there was no occupation at all."

This view is backed up by archive film showing people welcoming the incoming Soviet troops. German wartime documents are quoted as evidence that the Soviet forces were indeed welcome. According to the commentary, the Popular Front governments which came to power in all three republics embarked on housing programs which benefited the citizens. Landless peasants were given land. Preparations for democratic elections to elect new parliaments went ahead in the republics.

Next, Mavrik Vulfsons, USSR people's deputy and a member of the leadership of the Latvian Popular Front, speaks. He says:

"I would not go so far as to say that the elections were held under occupation conditions. Indeed, the troops did not directly interfere. But the elections were held in the conditions of Stalin's regime. These were the kind of elections which you know about, too. Everybody who voted received a stamp in his passport. So this was not an election, it was only voting".

The narrator recalls the visit to Moscow by delegations from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia to ask the Supreme Soviet to accept these peoples into the body of the USSR. Vulfsons gives his view of this:

"The Latvian Saeima was not empowered to do this. The power to proclaim Latvia a Soviet republic could only be obtained by a referendum, a plebiscite."

Next, British historian Geoffrey Roberts says it is a myth to say that the Baltic republics became a part of the USSR as a result of the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact. They continued to be independent after the pact. The republics only joined the USSR in 1940, after Hitler seized Western Europe, Roberts says. Only then did Stalin and Molotov decide to seek greater integration with the Baltic republics.

Speaking in Frankfurt-am-Main, Karsten Voigt, an Social Democratic Party deputy in the Bundestag and one of the leaders of the party, offers the view that, although the Hitler-Stalin pact should be condemned, this does not mean that its consequences should be ignored. The condemnation of this pact does not automatically mean that the Baltic republics should secede from the USSR, Voigt says. Such a demand would further aggravate an already complex situation.

The commentator concludes the program as follows:

"So, what did happen in 1940? We know that the lawlessness of the Stalin period did not spare the peoples of the Baltic Republics. Nevertheless, right is on the side of those who assert that in 1940 the act of joining the

USSR was an act of national salvation for the Latvians, Lithuanians, and Estonians."

The final credits acknowledge the help received from GDR television, television in West Germany, Sender Freies Berlin, and the BBC.

Estonian Party Leader Calls for Independence

LD2603211190 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 2000 GMT 26 Mar 90

[Report by correspondent Gabor Izbeki in Estonia]

[Text] An independent Estonian Communist Party can only exist in an independent Estonia. This has been stated by Enn-Arno Sillari, first secretary of the Estonian Communist Party, which has declared its independence. This was his first interview with a foreign journalist—with the Hungarian Radio correspondent.

We want to be a left-wing parliamentary party, we want democracy out of democratic centralism, the party leader said. He replaced Vaino Valjas who will be the chairman of the party and will represent the Estonian communists in international contacts. Not all of them, however, because at 0400 hours, at the end of the congress, a splinter group which amounted to a sixth of the congress delegates established the so-called Northern Party which groups together the conservative forces of the Russian speaking population from Tallinn and the northeastern coast. However, this force is only one-third of the Russian speaking population, thus the break has not followed a national, but rather a principled political line.

Girenko Says Estonian Party Split Not 'Dramatic'

PM2603190190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Mar 90 First Edition p 2

[Report by PRAVDA special correspondents I. Teterin and V. Shirokov: "One Congress, Two Central Committees?"]

[Text] Tallinn—The 20th Estonian Communist Party Congress ended work during the night of 26 March. The heated debate at the forum of Estonian Communists had lasted for three days in succession. From the very first hours of the congress, delegates had divided according to which of the two alternative options for restructuring the party they supported. Some were of the opinion that the republic Communist Party must become independent and struggle for Estonia's independence as a state. The second group said that the Estonian Communist Party does not have the right to sever its organizational unity with the CPSU and must conduct active practical work to create a new Soviet federation founded on a union treaty.

The congress adopted the Estonian Communist Party Program, which states the intention to form a new, independent Estonian Communist Party. This program will remain in effect until fall this year, when the next Estonian Communist Party Congress will be held. Then it will be adopted permanently, together with the statute of the renewed Communist Party.

The present period is described as transitional. Each communist must make his own independent choice as to how far he supports the idea of reorganizing the Estonian Communist Party into an independent party. The decision on the principles of relations with the CPSU will also be worked out later—in the light of the documents approved by the 28th CPSU Congress.

The Estonian Communist Party Congress adopted a decision on introducing the post of party chairman who is not a member of the Central Committee or its bureau and is answerable only to the congress itself. V. Vyalyas, former first secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, was unanimously elected to this post.

A decision was made on sending a delegation of Estonian communists to take part in the work of the 28th CPSU Congress. Some of the delegates to the forthcoming forum of USSR communists were elected. The remaining delegates will be elected through party districts.

The Estonian Communist Party Central Committee and its first secretary, E.-A. Sillari, were also elected.

The congress also discussed a document not included on the agenda: A statement that, as of 25 March, the Estonian Communist Party is an independent party.

Some delegates representing large industrial regions and enterprises deemed the adoption of this decision to be impossible. They refused to take part in the vote and said that, essentially, the question was one of transforming the Estonian Communist Party into a new party. A total of 123 delegates continued the 20th Estonian Communist Party Congress, declaring that they are the heirs of the Estonian Communist Party organizationally united with the CPSU. The decision was made to set up their own 35-member Central Committee: 19 members of this Central Committee were elected immediately, the remainder will be coopted onto it at a later date. A. Gusev and P. Panfilov were made secretaries of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee upholding organizational unity with the CPSU. They adopted a series of resolutions and appeals, in particular, a request to the CPSU Central Committee to recognize their credentials and a petition for assistance in resolving issues connected with the property of the Estonian Communist Party.

A.N. Girenko, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, attended the congress and addressed it. Commenting on the situation that has arisen in the Estonian Communist Party at the request of correspondents accredited here, he said that the CPSU will maintain relations with both wings of the party. This situation should not be regarded as something dramatic, because the 28th CPSU Congress is coming up and representatives of both currents in today's Estonian Communist Party will be present at the congress.

(A more detailed account of the 20th Estonian Communist Party Congress will be published in the next issues of PRAVDA.)

Further on 'Heated' Estonian Congress Debates

LD2603201690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 26 Mar 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer Dmitriy Biryukov] You probably know, comrades, that heated discussion took place at the Estonian Communist Party Congress. Speakers talked from various positions about crisis phenomena in the life of our society; about the future state system in the republic; and about the role and place of the Communist Party in a modern political system. Well, I am not going to start reiterating our correspondent's reportage. Have a look at how all of this took place:

[A. Barkhatov identified by screen caption] On the agenda of the last day of the congress is the adoption of the program of the Estonian Communist Party and election of leading bodies. For many delegates the preceding night was a sleepless one. Serious disagreements over the further course for the independence of the party did not make it possible, either yesterday or today, to break the intransigence of positions. This is something which, in the final analysis, could lead to a final split in the party. [video shows debating chamber, participants speaking to each other; speaker at rostrum; man speaking from the floor, waving a red card; red cards being raised by seated participants]. All of this forced Comrade Girenko, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to be the first at the rostrum. He called on participants not to succumb to emotions and to preserve the organizational unity of the party at least until the 28th CPSU Congress.

[Unidentified speaker] If you were a member of our party organization, would you vote for this program or not?

[Girenko, at the rostrum] I would vote against.

[Barkhatov] As a result of the first debates concerning the party the program, the Estonian Communist Party, was adopted by a majority of votes. Delegates have been elected for the forthcoming CPSU congress. Among the final documents is an appeal, also adopted by a majority, to communists in the republic (?with words to the effect that) the Estonian Communist Party supports the striving of the people of Estonia for the restoration of state independence. There is also the following line: We consider possible, in the transitional period, the combination, if so wished, of membership of the Communist Party of Estonia and membership of the CPSU. Further, the previous majority spoke out in favor of a telegram to the country's leading bodies to the effect that delegates of the 20th congress support, as stated, the Lithuanian peoples' struggle for independence. [video shows more speakers shown at the rostrum; three men seated near the rostrum; views of audience holding up their red cards.]

[V.I. Yarovoy, USSR people's deputy, Tallinn, identified by screen caption]...Further formation of the party on the basis of nationality. Therefore, I personally will not be voting for such a program document. [video shows participants raising red cards]

[Barkhatov] The congress also established the post of Communist Party chairman, the status of which is not traditional. [video shows one of three men seated near the rostrum taking the floor; continuing background noise of voices raised] He has the right to represent the Communist Party in talks with any state and public organizations, but at the same time the chairman is not a member of the Central Committee or a member of the Central Committee buro, and he is not acceptable to these permanently working bodies. Comrade Vyalyas was elected to the post of chairman. More than 200 congress delegates did not take part in the voting, and here, beyond this door, one floor above the main hall, their conference is taking place. [video shows meeting] A participant is shown saying, in Russian, "We have done everything." "For that reason we are not taking part in the voting." [video shows Barkhatov in hallway with congress delegate V.I. Chetvergov, identified by screen caption] What kind of decision have you made?

[Chetvergov] Within the composition of the secretariat of the Central Committee and four secretaries, to have two secretaries who stand in position, be we a 230 or 200 minority so to speak, and on that basis, in the transitional period, until the month of October, to resolve all questions.

[Barkhatov] Andrey Nikolayevich, one question: Tell me, please, what do you think, will the 20th congress or the 28th CPSU Congress be a determining factor in the fate of the Estonian Communist Party? [video shows Barkhatov interviewing A.N. Girenko, CPSU Central Committee secretary, identified by screen caption.]

[Girenko] Undoubtedly, the 28th CPSU Congress. Today a program has been adopted, of the Communist Party of Estonia, which announces that it is an independent party. This is just a program document. The party must, if it is formed, work with each member of the CPSU, each of whom must independently determine whether to adopt this program or not, after which a Communist Party of Estonia could be created, formed, an independent one, working on other principles with the CPSU than up to now.

Estonian Congress Ends; Loyalist Faction Formed

LD2603122790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 26 Mar 90

[Text] The 20th Congress of the Estonian Communist Party ended late last night [25 March]. It adopted a program which states the intention to set up a new independent Communist Party of Estonia. A six-month transitional period is envisioned for solving all the relevant questions. During this time, the document says, all the communists must make their choice: Either they choose the party that is being created or remain within the CPSU. The next congress of the Estonian Communist Party is to be held after the transitional period expires.

The post of party chairman, who is not accountable to the Central Committee and who is elected directly by the congress, has been introduced. Vyalyas, who had earlier worked as first secretary of the Communist Party of Estonia, was elected party chairman. Elections for a new republican Communist Party Central Committee, numbering 59 people, were held. The results of a secret ballot showed that four candidates did not get enough votes and, therefore, not all the places at the Central Committee were filled.

An organizational plenum, which was held during a break, elected Sillary, who had earlier worked as secretary of the Communist Party of Estonia Central Committee, as first secretary of the Central Committee.

After the congress had formally ended, some delegates—about 120 people—remained in the hall and continued work. Earlier, the group issued a statement declaring that those undersigned could not agree with the provisions of a program which urges separation from the CPSU. The statement says that the group of delegates continues the congress on the platform of struggle for a united CPSU. After the official end of the congress, all their work concentrated on solving the issue of whether to confine themselves to nominating four candidates for the vacant places in the Central Committee or to set up leading organs of their own. The second opinion prevailed. A Central Committee headed by Secretaries Gusev and Panfilov was elected.

A number of other organizational issues were examined, including the procedure for paying membership dues. The chairman of the Auditing Commission was elected. The new Central Committee sent a letter to the CPSU Central Committee requesting it to recognize its powers and a petition for assistance in solving issues related to the property belonging to the Estonian Communist Party.

Pensions Urged for Estonians Who Served in SS

PM2703075590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 24 Mar 90 First Edition p 6

[TASS correspondent A. Kharchenko report: "Pensions for... SS Men?"]

[Text] On the eve of the 45th anniversary of the Great Victory, the newspaper EESTEKSPRESS, which considers itself to be one of the most independent publications in the republic, raises the question of pensions for Estonian veterans who served in the... SS.

The author of the article, M. Metsamyart, writes that for thousands of young people who entered the 20th division of the SS, this was their only chance to fight for freedom... The divisions were headed by cadre Estonian servicemen, who, unlike the commanders of the Red Army Estonian units (Russian Estonians) tried to protect their own people. The author stresses that the time will come when history will give its fair assessment of Colonels Riypal, Reban, and Tuuling. The 20th SS division was an elite division. Its "glorious" military path is marked by a number of geographical names: Nevel, Mekhikoorma, Narva, Sinimyae.

Germany and the German people, the article goes on to say, will soon obtain their own borders. Let us hope that when we obtain freedom, the struggle against a common enemy will not be forgotten. The old men of Estonia are waiting for their war pensions. They have been waiting for a long time, M. Metsamyart says in distress.

Last year in third issue of the periodical VIKERKAAR carried an article by a young historian, M. Laar, which tells in detail about Estonians service in the troops of Hitler's Germany. In the summer a memorial was unveiled to the "Erna" espionage-sabotage group in Abwehr-2. Then a copper cross to the 20th SS Division appeared. Now the next step has been taken. And what will be next?

Estonia, Latvia View Support for Lithuania

LD2503140390 Vilnius International Service in English 2230 GMT 14 Mar 90

[Excerpts] And what is the reaction of the neighboring Latvia and Estonia to the recent developments in Lithuania? The goal of all the three Baltic states being the same—independence—Latvia and Estonia fully support its vanguard neighbor Lithuania. This is testified to by our correspondents' reports from Riga and Tallinn. The Estonian Popular Front stressed, in particular, that without an independent Lithuania there can be no independent Estonia. Eva Tark reports from Tallinn.

[Begin Tark recording] The head and heart of Estonia is with Lithuania today. The Estonian Popular Front has issued a statement saying that without independent Lithuania there would be no independent Estonia. The current chairman of the Popular Front Edgar Savisaar stressed in a TV programme that if we are not together with the Lithuania today, we have learned nothing from the history. [passage omitted]

The Popular Front of Estonia will organize rallies and meetings in support of independent Lithuania this Sunday and Monday in several towns in Estonia. [passage omitted]

Numerous deputies of the new Supreme Soviet and some deputies of the Estonian congress have said that we should quickly follow Lithuania in declaring independence as we are much stronger together. No need to speculate, now that the decision in Lithuania was made, on whether the time was right for that or there was a little bit of haste in declaring independence. [passage omitted] [end recording]

Eva Tark from Estonia: Latvia, meanwhile, is waited [as heard] for the newly elected parliament to get down to work. Will the Latvians follow Lithuania's suit and declare their independence at the very first session? Our correspondent Martins Gravitis reports from Riga:

[Begin Gravitis recording] Earlier this weekend in Moscow a Latvian (?parliament-Organized) commission met Mikhail Gorbachev to discuss the problems of Latvia regaining its sovereignty. The presenter Premeir Vilnis Bresis and chairman of the Supreme Soviet Anatoliy Gorbunov were amongst them to begin the talks. [passage omitted]

The newly-elected 170 members of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet plan to meet in the third session in approximately two weeks time, however, there is no telling whether this parliament is ready to venture the Lithuanian approach to solving this problem. [end recording]

Riga Mayor Chosen Ending Long Dispute

18005002

[Editorial Report] Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA on 14 March 1990 carries a 300-word report on page 4 announcing that on the evening of 12 March at an organizational session of the Riga gorsovet [city council] deputy A. Inkulis was chosen for the post of chairman of the Riga gorispolkom [city executive committee] putting an end to the drawn-out dispute between two opposing factions.

Council of Europe Delegation Visits Latvia

PM2603161390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 11

[TASS report under the general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] A delegation from the Council of Europe's committee for ties with the European countries which are not members of the Council of Europe completed its introduction to the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] 16 March. The guests had a conversation with A. Gorbunov, chairman of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, at the republic Council of Ministers and met with the leaders of the Latvian People's Front.

RSFSR

Results of Second Round of RSFSR Elections

LD2603192190 Moscow TASS in English 1838 GMT 26 Mar 90

[By TASS correspondent Lev Aksyonov]

[Text] Moscow March 26 TASS—The holders of more than 1,000 mandates of people's deputies of the Russian Federation out of the 1,068 mandates envisaged by legislation have been established by now. This was announced today at a meeting of the Central Electoral Commission of the Russian Federation.

120 people's deputies were elected in the first round held on March 4. More than 900 deputies were elected during runoffs held on March 14, 17 and 18. Repeated elections are to be held in 40 constituencies in late April-early May.

At today's meeting of the commission Vasiliy Kazakov, chairman of the Central Electoral Commission, summed up the results of the election.

The main conclusion is that the voters have supported the course of the Soviet Communist Party at the democratisation of the life of society. This is shown by the fact that communists account for 86 percent of the elected people's deputies.

Kazakov said that the commission received more than 7,000 complaints about various violations of the Law on Election. The commissions' investigation established that there were violations of the Law of Election at different stages of the election campaign, so new elections will be conducted in a number of constituencies. Complaints regarding 15 constituencies are being investigated and the conclusions will be drawn in the days ahead. So for some candidates the election campaign is not yet over. Kazakov also dwelt on drawbacks in the legislation which should be eliminated.

The list of elected people's deputies of the Russian Federation will be published in the days ahead.

Democratic Rossiya Wins Seats in City Councils

LD2703082190 Moscow World Service in English 0700 GMT 27 Mar 90

[Text] Left-wing radicals from the Democratic Rossiya bloc will hold most of the seats in the city councils of Moscow and Leningrad as a result of the elections to republican and local government bodies held in the Russian Federation. In Moscow, the bloc won 56 percent of the seats in the city council, and in Leningrad, 53 percent. Deputies from the bloc include communists and nonaffiliated persons. However, in the republican government bodies of the so-called democrats will hold no more than 15 percent of the seats.

Karachayevo-Cherkess Oblast Officials Elected

PM2703093590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 25 Mar 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Oblast Soviet Session"]

[Text] V.Ye. Lesnichenko, first secretary of the Karachayevo-Cherkess CPSU oblast committee, was elected chairman of the Karachayevo-Cherkess Oblast

Soviet of People's Deputies at a session of the oblast soviet held in the autonomous oblast. The oblast soviet presidium and standing committees and commissions were formed.

The session created a commission for the development of ethnic and interethnic relations and formed the oblast soviet of people's deputies executive committee. V.I. Khubiyev, who headed the previous oblast soviet executive committee, has been appointed chairman.

Coal Industry Minister Loses Vorkuta Election

LD2003204190 Moscow TASS in English 2026 GMT 20 Mar 90

[By TASS correspondent Viktor Makarov]

[Text] Vorkuta, Komi Autonomous Republic, March 20 TASS—There was keen competition at the election of people's deputies of the Russian Federation in the Pechora coal-mining area. Shift foreman of Komsomolskaya mine in Vorkuta, Viktor Yakovlev, was chosen over Minister of the USSR Coal Industry Mikhail Shchadov.

The Vorkuta arctic area was shaken by mining strikes last year. This social storm had a negative effect on the entire Soviet economy.

The miners decided to take the extreme measure, a strike, to press for economic independence of work collectives in the coal industry, their supply with good housing, the increase in the pay for strenuous and hazardous work of miners, and various benefits for work in the extreme conditions of the north and the solution of other social problems.

The miners achieved the adoption of a special decree of the Soviet Government which set out measures for the solution of problems miners raised.

Some 20 candidates were registered in the Vorkuta national- territorial district for the election of people's deputies of the Russian Federation. It includes the mining cities Vorkuta and Inta.

Viktor Yakovlev and Mikhail Shchadov had a considerable edge on their rivals in the first round and faced a runoff on March 18.

Making it to the second round was a considerable success for the minister of the coal industry. Vorkuta people explained this by the fact that the steps have been taken towards resolving problems posed by striking miners.

Vorgashorskaya mine, the biggest one in the Pechora coal basin, has been granted economic independence. Its collective now decides on the uses of the funds earned.

Vorkuta Ugol Amalgamation has become an amalgamation of independent enterprises managed by the recently elected Board of Directors.

A number of social demands of the miners have been fulfilled. There has been a rise in pay for work night shifts. The day-off at all mines is on the same day. These changes revived miners' confidence in promises of managers of the industry and won over many voters for Shchadov.

The minister had an edge in the poll in Inta, but lost in Vorkuta. On the whole, Yakovlev was elected by a margin of 501 votes. The margin is not very large, as the voter turnout was over 110,000.

Participants in Moscow Democracy Rally Polled

18120114A Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 8-9, 11-18 Mar 90 p 5

[Report by Igor Yakovenko, senior lecturer, Higher Party School: "People in the Square: Who? What For? Why?"]

[Text] **Results of the 25 February 1990 Rally and Sociological Survey**

Sociologists of Moscow's Higher Party School polled 856 random participants at the rally held in Moscow on 25 February.

Make your own conclusions as to what drew several hundred thousand people out onto the streets of Moscow.

1. Why did you come to the rally? *
69% - to support the consolidation of all democratic forces;
43% - to protest against the forces pushing the country towards a catastrophe;
11% - curiosity, to get new sociological information;
1% - no special reason.

2. How did you learn about the rally? *
29% - from the mass media;
29% - from a street poster;
28% - from my association, club, organization;
20% - from announcements made at the 4 February rally.

3. Whom are you going to support at the forthcoming elections?
72% - Democratic Russia bloc candidates;
23% - candidates regardless of their association with particular blocs or platforms;
1% - National Patriotic bloc candidates.

4. Do you know about the Democratic platform within the CPSU?
71% - yes;
29% - no.

5. If yes, what is your attitude towards it?
64% - positive;
5% - negative;
2% - no opinion.

6. Do you believe that the appeals by the USSR Supreme Soviet and the CPSU Central Committee in anticipation of possible disturbances and street unrest were well-grounded?
19% - yes;
65% - no;
15% - don't know.

7. If yes, where do you think the greatest threat of extremist actions comes from?
3% - from criminal elements;
50% - from corrupted elements in the Party and state apparat;
9% - from nationalistic groupings.

8. Which methods of settling political problems do you regard as the most effective today?
41% - action through the media;
49% - public rallies and demonstrations;
6% - picketing of offices and enterprises;
2% - armed or violent action as a last resort.
(At the same time the overwhelming majority of respondents—79%—stressed that the main factor is election victory.)

9. Do you belong to any unofficial organization, movement or association?
28% - yes;
72% - no.

10. Are you a CPSU member?
23% - yes;
77% - no.

Footnote
*When answering this question the respondent could check more than one answer. Therefore, the sum total exceeds 100%.

Vlasov Addresses Trade Union Congress

LD2103230890 Moscow TASS in English 1353 GMT 21 Mar 90

[Text] [no dateline as received] In his speech at the congress, Russian Federation Prime Minister Aleksandr Vlasov focused on the need to extend the sovereignty of the Russian Federation and optimise the correlation of its rights with the rights of other union republics and the Soviet Union as a whole.

He favored drafting a comprehensive national program to ensure the republic's real sovereignty and the stronger unity, free development and cohesion of all nations living within the Russian Federation.

Vlasov said that the republican government drafted a package of proposals to refine republican administrative, scientific and social structures and create a mass media system in Russia. These proposals will be submitted to the First Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation, which were elected this March.

Vlasov noted the negative tendencies in Russia's economy and stressed that the successful accomplishment of the socio-economic development tasks faced by the republic hinged on the implementation of sweeping economic reform.

"This reform renews relations of ownership, ensures a variety of ownership forms, creating equal conditions for their competition and an optimum combination between the plan and the market.

"In implementing the economic reform, the Government of the Russian Federation emphasizes switching the republic and its regions to self-governing and self-financing." Vlasov called for local initiative and enterprise but, at the same time, emphasized that Russia's Government decisively opposed economic separatism and the turning of the Russian Federation into a 'patchwork quilt'.

"The Russian Federation Government consistently seeks to increase the economy's social services. The share of resources for consumption and non-productive construction in the national income will grow by 86.8 percent in 1990 as against 78.7 percent in 1985," Vlasov stressed.

"A package of measures was developed to supply the population with commodities and build a modern industry to produce them. They envisage, above all, utilising the republic's production potential, implementing military industry conversion and re-orientating factories and plants to consumer wares production.

"Large funds were allotted to light industry enterprises to purchase machinery and equipment from foreign firms. Light and textile industry plants are being fitted out with advanced equipment on credits extended by Italy, West Germany and Japan," Vlasov said.

Western Republics

Ukraine Elects 442 of 450 People's Deputies

LD2203201890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 22 Mar 90

[Text] The results of the second round of voting in the Ukraine between 10 and 18 March have been released. During the voting 330 people's deputies of the repubic were elected. All of them have been registered. In one constituency the results of the voting are still being checked. All in all 442 out of 450 people's deputies have been elected. The successful deputies include 106 employees of public organizations; 78 persons involved in science, culture, education and health care; 26 workers; and 26 collective farmers. Some 375 deputies are members or candidate members of the CPSU, and there are four members of the Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League]. The deputies include 331 Ukrainians, 99 Russians, five Belorussians, four Jews, one Bulgarian, one Armenian, and one

German. Thirteen women have won seats in the republic's parliament. A second round of voting still has to take place in another seven constituencies.

Ukrainian CP Examines Letter to Rukh Members

LD2303202990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 23 Mar 90

[Text] The Secretariat of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee has examined a letter to the members of Rukh and to all the citizens of Ukraine, an appeal to the peasants, workers, and intelligentsia of Ukraine, and a draft charter for the Ukrainian Peasants Democratic Party, published in the LITERATURNA UKRAINA newspaper, which provide evidence of the intentions of certain groups to set up two new political parties in Ukraine. It was noted that the creation of parties is, in the present conditions, a matter for any groups of people. Only those parties or organizations which sow hostility between people, or fan interethnic strife, or whose activities lead to the destabilization of society and pose a threat to its peaceful life may not exist.

It is difficult to say at present how the authors of the document envision a Ukrainian Peasants Democratic Party although they do state that it is socialist. As for the political orientation of Rukh's future party, it is evident from the setter published in LITERATURNA UKRAINA and from the speeches of the Rukh leaders, including those in the foreign media, that its policies will be channelled to oppose the federation and the union states and toward Ukraine making a complete break with the USSR.

Proceeding from the requirements of the CPSU rules to the effect that a person cannot be a member of several political parties, the Secretariat of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee has stated that all members of the party who signed the documents in LITERATURNA UKRAINA have placed themselves outside the CPSU. The Party Control Commission will be tasked with examining this issue under the established procedure.

Ukrainian Party Secretariat Discusses Rukh Appeal

LD2603165890 Kiev in Ukrainian to North America 2200 GMT 23 Mar 90

[Text] The Secretariat of the Communist Party of Ukraine Central Committee has discussed the letter to members of Rukh [Ukrainian People's Movement for Perestroyka] and to all citizens of the Ukraine, the appeal to peasants, workers, and intelligentsia, and the draft rules of the Ukrainian Peasant-Democratic Party which appeared in LITERATURNA UKRAINA on 8 March.

These publications testify that certain groups intend to create in the Ukraine two new political parties. During the discussion of this question, it was stressed that the CPSU stated at its last plenums that it is prepared to work in multiparty conditions. The Communist Party of Ukraine Central Committee also repeatedly confirmed the striving of communists of the republic for constructive cooperation with all political organizations who are in favor of restructuring and socialism, called them to work together and be responsible for the renewal of life and the fate of people, and warned against confrontations.

The Secretariat of the Communist Party of Ukraine Central Committee emphasizes that forming a party is in present-day conditions a matter for this or that group of people. Only those parties and organizations are banned which sow hostility between people, fan up internationality discords and those activities lead to the destabilization of society and disruption of its peaceful life.

The Communist Party of Ukraine Central Committee believes that now, when all conditions are available for the emancipation of every communist and when party organizations have the right to solve independently all questions of intra-party life and influence the mapping-out of the party's policies, members of the CPSU will approach their choice in a balanced way and with great responsibility.

Proceeding from the CPSU rules to the effect that a person cannot be a member of several political parties at a time, the Secretariat states that all those party members who signed the documents in the LITERATURNA UKRAINA have in this way left the CPSU ranks.

'Radical' Deputies Taking Power in Lvov

LD2403142890 Moscow World Service in Russian 1030 GMT 24 Mar 90

[From the "Soviet Chronicle" feature of the "Soviet Union Day by Day" program—report attributed to INTERFAX]

[Text] An INTERFAX correspondent reports from Lvov that almost 90 percent of places in the city soviet belong to deputies from the informal organizations Rukh, Memorial, and others. Eighty percent of places in the oblast soviet belong to deputies of the democratic bloc. Thus power in the city and oblast is being transferred to radical deputies which may change the political, economic and social situation in the western Ukraine (Mikhail Batik), the deputy chairman of Lvov Memorial, declared in an interview with the INTERFAX correspondent.

Lvov Rally for Lithuania Draws 'Tens of Thousands'

LD2403124190 Moscow World Service in Russian 1030 GMT 24 Mar 90

[From the "Soviet Chronicle" feature of the "Soviet Union Day by Day" program—report attributed to INTERFAX]

[Text] A rally of tens of thousands in support of the Lithuanian parliament's decision on state independence of Lithuania has taken place in Lvov. It was organized by the Committee for the Protection of Workers' Rights. Calls demanding the separation of the western Ukraine from the USSR were heard at the rally.

Sevastopol Entry Restrictions Lifted

LD2603042190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0030 GMT 26 Mar 90

[Text] As of today, 26 March, the Internal Affairs Administration of the Crimean Oblast Executive Committee has lifted the prohibition on entry into the border region of the city of Sevastopol for citizens registered as residing in the oblast. We are taking the wishes of the Crimea's inhabitants into account when we simplified entry into the city, said (Rusnak), chief of the oblast executive committee's Internal Affairs Administration.

However, (Porfisenko), first deputy chairman of the executive committee of the Sevastopol City Soviet, stated that the local authories do not intend to rush to carry out this instruction, explaining this stance as being primarily because the decision was made without the participation of the Sevastopol City Soviet. Furthermore, the oblast executive committee has exceeded its authority; Sevastopol is a city subordinate to the republic.

The local authorities are explaining their unwillingness to open Sevastpol for free entry by citizens of the Crimean Oblast as being because of state-level interests and the secrets of the Black Sea Fleet. Considering that the U.S. defense secretary visited here two years ago and that a U.S. missile cruiser and frigate were the guests of Black Sea Fleet sailors last year, one may draw the conclusion that the real danger lies altogether elsewhere. People who come here will leave empty the already poorly stocked shelves of Sevastopol's shops. If one uses that argument, one ought to have first closed not only Moscow and Kiev, but even Simferopol to visits by citizens from all other oblasts.

Moldavian Front Official Interviewed

LD1203113990 Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA in Russian 22 Feb 90 p 2

[Interview with Anatol Shalaru, leader of the Mateyevich Club, one of the founding bodies of the Moldavian People's Front, and candidate people's deputy of the Moldavian SSR, by unidentified correspondent on 18 February in Kosteshty village, Yalovenskiy Rayon]

[Text] [SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA] It is said that the Mateyevich Club is an extremist movement. Is that true?

[Shalaru] We are neither radicals nor extremists. I would use the word constructivist instead. I think that we are the most constructive of all the groups standing on the People's Front platform. It is probably true that representatives of our club are the most forthright in what they say. I have even heard that we are called neo-Nazis. We link this with criticism which supporters of the club level at the Communist Party. On the whole we are in favor of healthy nationalism which is connected with patriotism and has nothing in common with chauvinism. I personally favour thinking which welcomes such feelings in a person as love for the history of his people and its culture and abhor thinking which seeks to arouse hatred in people for others.

[SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA] What about the anti-Russian appeals and slogans then?

[Shalaru] Our club has never had such things and does not have them now. If such appeals have appeared then they have come from individuals who really do have extremist views. God made us all different. And the movement does not support actions which are aimed against other peoples. I often visit villages where peasants frequently ask: Why are you against the Russians? And I say - we aren't against them. We are against social injustice and migration but not against the Russians.

[SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA] Talking of migration, in your election addresses you raise the issue of a law on migration. What do you mean by that? Do you mean a law as a method of regulating the national composition of the population?

[Shalaru] I mean a law as a method of regulating, of course, but not as a means of expelling the Russian-speaking population. The migration which led to the current situation was the result of Stalin's policy of mixing nations. It was by no mere chance that intensive migration was promoted. The result lies in russianized towns and unemployment in villages. This is why some people hate the immigrants. But this arises from misunderstanding. People do not know against whom to direct their anger. Failing to understand that this was a central policy they began to vent their displeasure on ordinary people. I have long expressed the view, and I am still of the opinion now, that friction between the nationalities is an artificially manufactured issue aimed at kindling dissent between the nationalities. When the people's movement against bureaucracy and the mafia began to grow a wedge was driven between people of different nationalities.

[SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA] The most discussed question of recent times has been the republic's sovereignty. What does the Mateyevich Club mean by that? Does sovereignty mean leaving the union?

[Shalaru] If you are talking about full sovereignty then then that means leaving the USSR. If you are talking about confederation then you have to decide what sort of confederation you mean. Therefore, we must define what sort of sovereignty we need today, although the concept of "sovereignty" indeed presupposes full independence. But the people must decide this. I can only give my personal view of the problem: The union should be a confederation of 15 sovereign and independent states. No diktat from the center. Mutual relations based on treaties. The union parliament should be based on the all-European principle with equal representation from the republics, for that indeed is the way to safeguard equal rights. And by this I mean an economic not a political parliament. That is the form of confederation that I favor.

This way of looking at the question is dictated by the following: I understand perfectly that if the issue of leaving the union is raised in the republic then what happened in Baku may be repeated here. That is why I favor confederation.

I would also like to say a word about citizenship. A law on citizenship should be one of the first to be adopted by the new republican parliament. People living in Moldavia should have the right to call themselves citizens of Moldavia, regardless of their nationality. This is a sort of oath of allegiance to the republic. If anyone does not wish to comply then that's up to them but if they also fail to respect the laws of the republic then they should be declared persona non grata.

[SOVETSKAYA MOVDAVIYA] One of the points in the election platform of the People's Front is the restoration of historical frontiers. What does that mean?

[Shalaru] We must return to the frontiers which existed in 1940. I think that this must be done in a civilized way. The two republics involved, Moldavia and the Ukraine, should hold talks. And the fact that Tiraspol will be Moldavian speaking won't make things any easier for us, especially as Tiraspol and some of the villages on that side of the Dnestr were never ours. They could be given to the Ukraine. But our age-old lands, now part of Odessa and Chernovtsy Oblasts, should be given back to us. Perhaps we should exchange territories instead of arguing?

'Deterioration' of Situation in Moldavia

LD2603223590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2130 GMT 26 Mar 90

[Text] Moldavia. The Presidium of the Republic's Supreme Soviet has adopted a decision in connection with the deterioration here of the social and political situation. The reason was an unsanctioned procession, the blocking of transport, and the picketing of government buildings in Kishinev. As has been reported, at the Central Committee plenum of the Moldavian Communist Party the program of the republican Communist Party for its routine congress was examined. An alternative, even more radical program was also proposed, but it did not receive support. In this respect, (Khadyrke), chairman of the Moldavian Popular Front, who spoke at the plenum, after appraising the activity of the Communist Party of Moldavia negatively, announced that he was leaving its ranks.

At a many-thousand-strong meeting on Sunday [25 March] the leaders of the People's Front of Moldavia and deputies of the republic's Supreme Soviet evaluated the elections that had passed as a major victory for the national democratic forces. The main links in the program they intend to already start implementing at the first session of the republic's Supreme Soviet.

Localized State of Emergency Threatened

PM2603144590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Eduard Kondratov report under the "Direct Link" rubric: "Situation Deteriorating"]

[Text] Kishinev—Sunday's newspapers published a Moldavian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Presidium decree "On the Deterioration of the Sociopolitical Situation in the Republic."

It was prompted by unsanctioned processions, blockading of transportation, and picketing of government buildings in Kishinev. The resolution warns that failure to obey the law could force government organs to impose a state of emergency in certain areas. Full responsibility for this would lie with the organizers of the unrest.

The first session of the Kishinev City Soviet ended in the small hours of Saturday morning after many hours of debate, since the deputies were unable to reach agreement on fundamental issues. The Russian-speaking deputies walked out of the auditorium, leaving it without a quorum.

The hunger strike near the monument to Stephen the Great continues. The uncompromising attitude of its participants is based on their demands for a number of leaders to be severely punished or discharged.

A plenum of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee was held Saturday to examine the Moldavian Communist Party's platform for its 17th Congress. An alternative, more radical program was proposed, but failed to win support. In this connection USSR People's Deputy I. Khadyrke, chairman of the Moldavian People's Front, who made a negative assessment of the Moldavian Communist Party's activity, stated that he was resigning from the party. He repeated his declaration at the thousands-strong National Front rally on Sunday and received an ovation. The rally was timed to coincide with the anniversary of the 1918 "Sfatul tseriy" [words as transliterated] decision on reunification with Romania.

This is probably the first time that the Moldavian People's Front has spoken out without concealing its intentions. Its leaders and the Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet deputies who spoke assessed the elections as a major victory for national democratic forces. The main components of the program which they intend to begin implementing at the first session of the republic's Supreme Soviet are the following: transferring full power to the genuine Moldavian patriots who are campaigning for Moldavia's full independence from the USSR, nominating them to the most important state posts and the presidency of the republic, replacing ministries with free associations and concerns, transferring land to the peasants, and restoring Moldavia's historic frontiers.

Caucasus

Bus Attacked in Nagorno-Karabakh; 1 Killed

LD2603181290 Moscow TASS in English 1801 GMT 26 Mar 90

[Text] Stepanakert March 26 TASS—Unidentified people opened fire today on a bus carrying Azerbaijanis near the village of Drmbon, Mardakert District of the Nagorno-Karabakh autonomous territory, an official at the commandant's office of the state of emergency area in Nagorno-Karabakh and adjacent areas of Azerbaijan told TASS.

The bus was going from Mir-Bashir to Kelbadjar.

According to preliminary reports, one passenger was killed and four others were injured.

Militia found cartridge-cases from submachine-guns and carbines at the accident site.

Militia, aided by Interior Ministry troops, are making efforts to indentify and detain the criminals.

Colonel P.G. Bogokhudov, chief of the political department of the commandant's office, said "the resumption of militant activities, now that there are prerequisites for the further normalisation of the situation in the autonomous territory, provoke indignation."

"These actions not only slow down positive changes but harm the Azerbaijani and Armenian peoples, reversing progress towards the normalisation of the situation in Nagorno-Karabakh."

Fadeyev Appealed to on Train Bombing

LD2603201990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 26 Mar 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] We received these reports from Baku and Yerevan just before the program started. They recount events which happened very recently. I am not going to define the extent of the alarm: You can reach your own conclusions from what you hear and see.

[Mamedov] What you can now see on your screens are not the results of an accident. It is far worse: sabotage. On 25 March, close to the Karchevan station situated on the territory of Armenia, an explosive device went off under a locomotive taking a passenger train to Norashen-Baku. The specialists' view is that the explosion was carried out by remote control. Fortunately, no one was killed or injured. However, a 150 meter section of track was destroyed, three cars were damaged, and the locomotive was blown in two. This blatant instance of daring sabotage clearly showed that destablization of the situation and an end to railway traffic is essential for certain circles. Since 24 March, railway traffic between the two republics has been stopped once again.

[Fadeyev, first deputy USSR minister of railways] I see what happened as a well thought through and carefully planned act of sabotage. It is not the first instance here, and as you will remember an instruction was given, first of all to Comrade Bakatin, minister of internal affairs, to assume special control and protection of this section in order to provide a guarantee that trains could pass through here in safety. This was not done, however, and I will, if you are able to show it, take the opportunity of turning to Comrade Bakatin to say that the time has come for action. All those who, so to speak, are doing such things today must be punished on the one hand, while guarantees must be provided on the other. Railway workers cannot work, nor can there be passengers, just in case. It has to be said that this section is the frontier. There are huge artificial constructions panels, anti- avalanche barriers. All of this is very dangerous and must be kept under observation by whoever the government now entrusts. I will say outright that this must not be tolerated any longer.

Further on Azerbaijan-Armenian Border Situation

Azerbaijan Condemns Attacks

NC2603112890 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 25 Mar 90

[Text] At the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers:

Contrary to the union and the Azerbaijan SSR organs' recent efforts to normalize the situation in the region, the nationalist and extremist forces in the Armenian SSR have been trying to strain the situation further, to grossly violate the Azerbaijan SSR's sovereignty, and to carry out armed attacks on the border settlements in Azerbaijan. Bands of brigands, which have been armed with weapons suitable to realize these malicious intentions, are being used. Setting fire to houses and killing peaceful citizens in Kazakhskiy Rayon, blasting a railway juncture on the Kerchivan-Megri section of the railway, and firing on (?Keberek) and Kerki in the Nakhichevan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR] and on (?Miladi) in the Armenian SSR, where Azerbaijanis live, indicate the number of forces in the Armenian SSR intentionally performing acts to further intensify interethnic discord and hostility.

The Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers strongly condemn the hostile activities, which have caused deaths and significant material losses. All these groups categorically object to the leading Armenian SSR organs, which have not taken any measures to collect the large number of arms the people possess. On the contrary, the arms that individuals possess are not being controlled, and combat groups are being organized and deployed in the border region of the Azerbaijan SSR.

The republic's workers have been expressing serious anxiety and uneasiness because some union organs failed to effect the required standards with a view to obstructing criminal intentions, anticonstitutional activities, and unending law violations against the Azerbaijanis.

Pointing to the extremely dangerous situation as a result of increasing attacks on the republic's border rayons, the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers has urged the Soviet Government to consider immediately adopting measures aimed at guaranting the people's security and providing for a peaceful existence along the entire border with the Armenian SSR. The question is creating a system to safeguard the border region against possible armed attacks.

The republic's Committee for State Security and the Ministry of Internal Affairs were instructed to take all necessary measures to protect the people and their property against extremist forces' armed attacks. Special operative groups affiliated with the Committee for State Security and the Ministry of Internal Affairs have been sent where the incidents occurred. Together with the units of the internal forces affiliated with the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs they are taking additional measures to prevent attacks on the Azerbaijan SSR's territorial integrity and on citizens' peaceful lives.

The republic's procuracy, the Committee for State Security, and the Ministry of Internal Affairs were instructed to work together with the union organs to carefully investigate the recent crimes.

The Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers call on the people and all the workers of Azerbaijan to act with common sense, maturity, and calmness. We intend to maintain a strong and resolute approach for the sake of our republic's interests and for the sake of strengthening our republic's sovereignty.

Armenia's Arutyunyan Interviewed

LD2603203190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 26 Mar 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast; interview with Usik Surenovich Arutyunyan, Armenian SSR internal affairs minister by correspondent Nazaryan—recorded]

[Text] [Nazaryan] Usik Surenovich, recently, reports have once again appeared that the situation in the border rayons of Armenia and Azerbaijan has again been exacerbated.

[Arutyunyan] Practically, up until the present day, that situation never has been, on the whole, particularly calm or stable.

[Nazaryan] Nevertheless, the first 20 days of March were more or less calm, isn't that so?

[Arutyunyan] The situation was more or less stabilized at the beginning of March. However, unfortunately, we had the biggest such outburst on 23 March, when at 1930, and later, a column of motor vehicles was fired upon which was returning from the disaster zone. The very next day, on the whole, the situation could not be controlled. A farm was set on fire in the Armenian village and the Armenian side, well, set fire to several houses in the Azerbaijan village and the situation was white hot to the limit, and well, only the intervention of a squad of armed forces of the Supreme Army stabilized the situation. Well, what conclusion can be drawn here? In general, measures need to be taken, both on one side and the other, by law enforcement bodies and party and local soviet bodies, and by those same unofficial organizations in order to stabilize the situation. In general, measures need to be taken, both on the Armenian and the Azerbaijan side in order to put an end to such provocations.

[Nazayan] And first of all, to confiscate arms.

[Arutyunyan] On the whole, about 35 percent of weapons were confiscated by us during February-March. [video shows Arutyunyan being interviewed by Nazaryan]

Yerevan Refutes TASS

NC2703102490 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 26 Mar 90

[Excerpts] TASS correspondents report that the information coming from the Armenian and Azerbaijan republics is disquieting and alarming. [passage omitted] Here is our editorial board's reply entitled: "New Deceptions by TASS."

To the uninformed radio listener, this TASS report appears completely factual and steeped in sorrow, lamenting the Armenian extremists, who [words indistinct] in the region, inciting emotion.

[Words indistinct], it appears that the central authorities have initiated a new campaign through TASS. As is always the case in such situations, the names of those who made up this report do not appear under the text. Let us analyze a few pieces of evidence that will help correction [words indistinct] in that report [passage indistinct].

Part of the TASS report says that 15 people, members of the Association for National Self-Determination in Armenia's Artashatskiy Rayon, armed with automatic weapons and pistols, burst into the staff offices of party and soviet bodies and threatened them with physical reprisals. Our colleague contacted Zaven Gevorgyan, first secretary of the Artashatskiy Rayon Party Committee, to find out what really happened. Comrade Gevorgyan said: Some young people came to see me, but I was not there. When the office secretary asked them what message she should give me, the young people told her they wanted to know how the party secretary could help them. The report about them carrying automatic weapons and pistols is a dirty lie. I have already submitted a protest note against TASS to the procuracy.

The rest of the TASS report concerns incidents in Noyemberyanskiy Rayon. As you have already heard, the report says the Armenian guerrillas attacked Aksikhara, Vaganis, and Ayrum villages during which seven Azerbaijanis died and an Armenian woman and child were wounded. Who instigated and started this clash? There is nothing in the TASS report on this. The telephone conversation between our colleague and Vartan Khachikyan, first secretary of Noyemberyanskiy Rayon Party Committee, revealed that on 23 March the Azerbaijanis attacked Kazakhskiy Rayon's [name indistinct] village near the Idzhevan-Noyemberyan road [words indistinct] (?as well as) the school in the Armenian village of (?Voskedar). [Words indistinct] the Soviet Union's news agency [words indistinct] is (?attempting) to mislead the entire country and provoke new reprisals against the Armenians.

Radio Liberty's Reports on Azerbaijan Criticized

NC2703091690 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0440 GMT 27 Mar 90

[From the republican press review]

[Text] Dear listeners, it is no longer a secret for us that many of the mass media organs in the world and in the union continue to level calumnies against the Azerbaijanis and resort to the most contemptuous moves to (?weaken) them in the eyes of the world through [word indistinct]. One of these mass media organs is Radio Liberty's Armenian-language section. Recently the radio aired a so-called [word indistinct] report. It claimed that the Armenian residents of [word indistinct], Kamu, and Albas towns in Azerbaijan's Khanlarskiy Rayon were forced to immigrate with the help of the internal units of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, and that Azerbaijanis have settled in their homes. The Armenian Supreme Soviet Presidium [words indistinct] in KOMMUNIST, which is published in Armenia. It was claimed that the residents of these towns, who concerned themselves with nothing else but [words indistinct] and caring for cattle, lived [words indistinct], but are being forced to immigrate at the present time.

How unconscientious one must be to circulate such reports. [Words indistinct] the Armenian brigands. They did not allow us to live in peace on our own land. [passage indistinct] We now observe that Radio Liberty [words indistinct] in connection with the refugees. Obviously, the radio said the Azerbaijanis have moved into the empty houses. Well, it could have also said that the Indians in South America should have moved into them. They can say whatever they wish. We all know that the employees of (?any) republic, who are affiliated with various forces, can spread any false information and [words indistinct].

Central Asia

New Uzbek Council of Ministers Chairman Named

LD2603164590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1612 GMT 26 Mar 90

[Text] Tashkent, 26 March. (TASS)—Fifty-one-year-old Shukurilla Mirsaidov today became the new chairman of the Council of Ministers of Uzbekistan. The resolution on his appointment as head of government was adopted at the session of the Supreme Soviet of this Soviet Central Asian republic, which is currently in progress.

There was another candidate for the post, Mirakhmat Mirkasymov, who has headed the government of the republic until today. A secret ballot was held following a detailed discussion of the programs and personal businesslike qualities of the candidates, as a result of which a majority of deputies favored Mirsaidov.

The new premier is an Uzbek whose higher education was in finance and economics, and he is a doctor of economic sciences. He has worked in Uzbekistan's planning bodies since 1959. He has been a communist since 1962. He was mayor of Tashkent, the republic's capital, for five years and while in that job did a great deal to strengthen its multifaceted relations with its twinned city of Seattle, (USA). Last year he was appointed deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers and chairman of the State Planning Committee of Uzbekistan.

Kazakhstan Election Results Reported

LD2603165190 Moscow TASS in English 1632 GMT 26 Mar 90

[By TASS correspondent Gennadiy Kulagin]

[Text] Alma-Ata March 26 TASS—At the March 25 elections in Kazakhstan, the voters chose only 131 deputies in a total of 270 constituencies. Run-offs between the two top contestants will be held in 126 electoral districts and new elections in 13 districts.

Observers attribute the election results to the number of alternative candidates, an average of four per seat.

Elections in public organisations, assigned 90 mandates by the republican law, were held earlier and eighty-one deputies were elected. New candidacies are to be nominated for the remaining nine seats.

Nursultan Nazarbayev, local Communist Party chief and president of the Supreme Soviet, defeated his rival, a collective farm chairman, by a large margin, winning 92 percent of the votes. Republican Prime Minister Uzakbay Karamanov won 82 percent.

Several candidates from party and local government bodies were defeated. Some departmental heads of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee, secretaries of several regional party committees and chairmen of executive committees of local soviets did not qualify for the second round.

The turn-out was high: 83.9 percent of eligible voters took part in the polls.